DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 984 SP 002 479

By-Miller, Leon, Ed.

The Director of Student Teaching: Characteristics and Responsibilities. Research Bulletin 7.

Association for Student Teaching.

Pub Date 68

Note-92p.

Available from-Publications-Sales Section, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (single copy $1.50)

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-*Administrative Personnel, Administrator Characteristics, *Student Teaching

This survey investigates the characteristics and responsibilities of the director of student teaching in United States colleges and universities. Consisting of explanatory sections with graphs revealing data gathered (through a questionnaire) from student teaching directors, the report covers their educational and personal characteristics (age, sex, marital status, children, educational preparation, teaching experience), their salary and fringe benefits, their work load, their job satisfaction, their responsibilities, their major problems, and the characteristics of institutions employing them. A summary of the data is presented as the concluding chapter, and the questionnaire which was used for the study is appended. (SM)

ED028984

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICRO-FICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

RESEARCH BULLETIN

THE DIRECTOR OF STUDENT TEACHING

CHARACTERISTICS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

SP002479

ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Director of Student Teaching: Characteristics and Responsibilities

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICRO-FICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

A Publication of the

Committee on Research

The Association for Student Teaching

1968

1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

SP002479

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office to Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

Copyright © 1968

The Association for Student Teaching

Richard Collier, Executive Secretary
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

First Printing

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 62-1604

Discounts: single copy of each title, full price; 2-9 copies of a title, 10 percent; 10 or more copies of a title, 20 percent; to bookstores and other agencies for resale purposes, 20 percent on shipments to one address.

Shipping Charges: orders amounting to $2.00 or less must be accompanied by payment. The National Education Association will pay shipping and handling charges on all orders accompanied by payment. Any orders not accompanied by payment will be billed with shipping and handling charges. Make all checks or money orders payable to the NEA. Order from Publications-Sales Section, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Price: $1.50

PREFACE

THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE OF the Association for Student Teaching has prepared six bulletins during the past 10 years concerned with research on professional laboratory experiences in teacher education. This seventh volume is a welcome addition since it presents data, not previously available, regarding administrators of student teaching programs. Directors of direct professional experience have a vital and important role in the preparation of teachers. The Association is indeed pleased to publish information that recognizes the significant function of these educational leaders.

These data, which portray the status and professional characteristics of administrators of student teaching programs, are presented by the Association as a source of information. They should prove valuable to researchers as a basis for further research, to students and administrators in higher education, and to other educational leaders.

To Researchers LeRoy Griffith and Ray Martin and to Leon Miller, editor of this report, the Association for Student Teaching expresses sincere appreciation for this valuable contribution to the professional literature.

ALBERTA LOWE
President
The Association for
Student Teaching

The Association for Student Teaching
1967 - 68
The National Officers

Officers

President

Alberta L. Lowe
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

First Vice President

E. Brooks Smith
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

Second Vice President

Curtis E. Nash
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan

Executive Secretary

Richard Collier
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Immediate Past President

Dorothy McGeoch
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York

Executive Committee

Lillian Pease 1968 S
Lincoln Public Schools
Lincoln, Nebraska

Bill J. Fulleron 1968 °
Wichita University
Wichita, Kansas

Grant Clothier 1968 A
Mid-Continent Regional Education Laboratory
Kansas City, Missouri

C. W. Truax 1968 A
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Isabel Howard 1969 S
Glen Grove School
Glenview, Illinois

James D. Lundstrom 1969 S
Central High School
Fargo, North Dakota

Duaine C. Lang 1969 °
Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Helen L. Richards 1969 °
Grambling College
Grambling, Louisiana

Helen Paynter 1970 S
College Hill School
Evanston, Illinois

William A. Bennie 1970 °
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Floyd C. Hill 1970 °
Eastern Oregon College
LaGrande, Oregon

Wesley J. Matson 1970 °
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

° Elected at large
A Administrator
S Supervising Teacher (works with children)

FOREWORD

SOME THREE YEARS AGO a question raised by a director of student teaching implied that directors of student teaching do not receive the same considerations for promotions or status that other faculty members receive in institutions of higher learning. His letter and question were brought to the attention of the Committee on Research of the Association for Student Teaching. Out of the basic question grew this research bulletin, which enlarges the problem and studies the role of directors of student teaching in a comprehensive manner.

This status study reveals many findings and has many facets worthy of further investigation. There appears to be no clear-cut mode of the definition of the position, although there is a core of duties which all seem to perform. The actual titles of persons performing the duties vary considerably, depending to a large extent on the type and size of the institution; but generally, directors of student teaching receive rank, salary, and status comparable to that of their colleagues in teacher education.

Institutions starting or expanding their programs in teacher education should find this study particularly useful, since it does give particular attention to the role of the chief administrators of student teaching programs.

I wish to express my appreciation to those individuals who made this study possible. Special recognition should be given to Dr. John A. Schmitt, Director of Testing Services, Boston College, for his assistance in compiling the data.

LEON F. MILLER
Chairman
Committee on Research
AST, 1964-67

AST COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Chairman: Leon F. Miller
Northwest Missouri State College, Maryville, Missouri (1967)

L.H. Griffith
Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona (1967)

Robert Threatt
Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia (1968)

Leonard E. Kraft
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois (1968)

William J. Walsh
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan (1967)

Walter R. Robinette
University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana (1968)

Bernice Wolfson
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin (1969)

Donald P. Johnson
Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee (1969)

Milan B. Dady
Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky (1967)

Ray Martin
Boston College, Boston, Massachusetts (1969)

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. Introduction 1
II. Educational and Personal Characteristics 5
III. Salary and Fringe Benefits 25
IV. Work Load 33
V. Job Satisfaction 53
VI. Responsibilities 59
VII. Major Problems 61
VIII. Summary 63
Appendix (Questionnaire) 67

TABLE 1. Financing of the Institutions 2
2. Size of Community 3
3. Graduate and Undergraduate Enrollees, Fall Semester, 1965-66 Academic Year 3
4. Graduate and Undergraduate Enrollees in Colleges of Education, Fall Semester, 1965-66 Academic Year 4
5. Sex of Directors 5
6. Number of Directors—By Sex and Institutional Support 6
7. Age of Directors—By Sex 7
8. Marital Status of Directors 8
9. Children of Directors 8
10. Highest Degree Earned—By Sex 10
11. Highest Degree Earned—By Sex and Institutional Support 11
12. Degree Held When Became Director—By Sex and Institutional Support 13
Undergraduate and Graduate Majors of Directors 14
14. Doctor's Degree Subject Area 15
15. Doctor's Degree Subject Area—By Sex and Institutional Support 16
16. Teaching Experience—By Level 18
17. Teaching Experience—By Sex and Level 20
18. Teaching Experience at Supervisory Level—By Sex 21
19. Years as Supervising Teacher—By Sex and Institutional Support 22
20. Years as College Supervisor—By Sex and Institutional Support 23
21. Number of Different Directorships Held—By Sex 24

22. Gross Annual Salary 24
23. Gross Annual Salary—By Sex 26
24. Range in Salaries—By Institutional Financing, Sex, and Rank 27
25. Median Salaries—By Institutional Financing, Sex, and Rank 29
26. Supplementary Benefits 30
27. Supplementary Benefits—Private Institutions 31
28. Supplementary Benefits—Public Institutions 32
29. Noninstructional Activities 34
30. Time Devoted to Director of Student Teaching Duties—By Sex and Institutional Support 36
31. Time Devoted to Other Administrative Duties—By Sex and Institutional Support 37
32. Time Devoted to Other Advisement Duties—By Sex and Institutional Support 38
33. Time Devoted to Public Service—By Sex and Institutional Support 40
34. Time Devoted to Sponsored Research—By Sex and Institutional Support 41
35. Time Devoted to Individual Research—By Sex and Institutional Support 42
36. Time Devoted to Other Duties—By Sex and Institutional Support 43
37. Instructional Activities 44
38. Time Devoted to On-Campus Teaching—By Sex and Institutional Support 46
39. Time Devoted to Extension Teaching—By Sex and Institutional Support 47
40. Time Devoted to Supervising Student Teaching—By Sex and Institutional Support 48
41. Time Devoted to Other Activities—By Sex and Institutional Support 49
42. Nonprofessional Assistants 50
43. Professional Assistants 51
44. Professional Groups 52
45. Committee Assignments 52
46. Job Satisfaction 54-55
47. Job Satisfaction—By Degree 58
48. Responsibilities of Directors 60
49. Major Problems of Directors 62

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

INCREASED ACCEPTANCE of the important role of teacher education in society has fostered further study of elements of the student teaching program in the United States. Within the past few years, as a part of this evaluation program, studies of the characteristics of college supervisors and supervising teachers involved in student teaching programs have been considered at length in numerous publications.[1] While in-depth studies have been conducted on these two important components of the student teaching program, there is a dearth of studies on the director of student teaching. Therefore, the chairman of the Research Committee of the Association for Student Teaching selected two of his committee members to study the characteristics and responsibilities of the director of student teaching in U.S. colleges and universities. The project was undertaken because it was felt that the information gained would be of value and of use to those responsible for assigning duties to directors of student teaching. The data should also be valuable to all individuals involved in professional laboratory experiences.

Scope and Procedures of Study

To determine the characteristics and responsibilities of the director of student teaching, a questionnaire was developed during the summer of 1965. A pilot study was conducted in September 1965 to improve this instrument. On the basis of the recommendations of the directors used in the pilot study, certain changes were made in the questionnaire. In October 1965 the refined questionnaire (see Appendix) was mailed to each director of student teaching at the 661 institutions of higher education listed as members of the American Association of Colleges for

---

[1] See the following publications of the Association for Student Teaching: *Professional Growth and Inservice of the Supervising Teacher*, Forty-Fifth Yearbook, 1966; *The College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenge*, Forty-Third Yearbook, 1964; and *The Supervising Teacher, Standards for Selection and Function, A Position Paper*, 1966.

Teacher Education in their 1964 Yearbook.[2] Separate questionnaires were also mailed to each director in institutions employing directors of both elementary and secondary student teaching.

Characteristics of Institutions Employing Respondents

By January 15, 1966, completed questionnaires were received from 468 directors of student teaching. This return represented 69.9 percent of the total number of directors to whom questionnaires were mailed. These returned questionnaires came from 459 (69.4 percent) of the 661 institutions included in the study. Table 1 shows how these 459 colleges and universities are financed. Of the colleges and universities, 53.6 percent are financed at public expense; 46 percent are privately financed.

TABLE 1 FINANCING OF THE INSTITUTIONS

Institution	Number of colleges	Percent
Public	246	53.6
Private*	211	46.0
No response	2	00.4
Total	459	100.0

*Includes parochial

Table 2 shows the size of the communities surrounding these teacher education institutions. The greatest percentage of the schools (65.8 percent) were located in communities with fewer than 100,000 people. Of the schools, 105 (22.9 percent) were in communities of 10,000 to 29,999, 95 (20.7 percent) were in communities of 30,000 to 99,999, and 74 (16.1 percent) were in communities of 100,000 to 499,999. Approximately 8 percent of the communities had over one million people; only 4.8 percent had less than 2,500.

To show the characteristics of the institutions employing the respondents more clearly, data were gathered on the size of the surrounding communities. Table 3 includes the number and

[2] American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. *Freedom with Responsibility in Teacher Education*. Seventeenth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: the Association, a department of the National Education Association, 1964. 217 pp.

TABLE 2 SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Number of people	Number of colleges	Percent
0 - 2,499	22	4.8
2,500 - 4,999	33	7.2
5,000 - 9,999	47	10.2
10,000 - 29,999	105	22.9
30,000 - 99,999	95	20.7
100,000 - 499,999	74	16.1
500,000 - 1,000,000	41	8.9
Over 1,000,000	36	7.9
No response	6	1.3
Total	459	100.0

TABLE 3 GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLEES, FALL SEMESTER, 1965-66 ACADEMIC YEAR

Number of people	Number of colleges	Percent
0 - 499	11	2.4
500 - 1,499	150	32.7
1,500 - 3,999	112	24.4
4,000 - 7,999	84	18.3
8,000 - 14,999	57	12.4
15,000 - 24,999	24	5.2
Over 24,999	17	3.7
No response	4	0.9
Total	459	100.0

percent of graduate and undergraduate enrollees during the fall semester of the 1965-66 academic year. The majority (approximately 60 percent) of the institutions enrolled fewer than 3,999 students. However, 84 institutions (18.3 percent)

enrolled between 4,000 and 7,999 students; 57 institutions (12.4 percent), between 8,000 and 14,999 students; and 15,000 or more students were enrolled in 8.9 percent of the institutions.

Table 4 shows the number and percent of graduate and undergraduate college of education enrollees in the employing institutions. Most institutions enrolled fewer than 3,000 college of education students. Of these institutions, 26.8 percent enrolled from 150 to 499 college of education students, 18.1 percent enrolled from 500 to 999, and 26.1 percent enrolled from 1,000 to 2,999. Only two institutions enrolled 10,000 or more college of education students.

TABLE 4

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLEES IN COLLEGES OF EDUCATION, FALL SEMESTER, 1965-66 ACADEMIC YEAR

Number of students	Number of colleges	Percent
0 - 149	43	9.3
150 - 499	123	26.8
500 - 999	83	18.1
1,000 - 2,999	120	26.1
3,000 - 4,999	42	9.2
5,000 - 9,999	18	3.9
Over 9,999	2	0.5
No response	28	6.1
Total	459	100.0

Organization of Report

The rest of this report consists of seven sections on the characteristics and responsibilities of the director of student teaching. Chapter II considers some important educational and personal characteristics. Chapter III describes the salary and fringe benefits of the directors of student teaching, while Chapters IV and V concentrate on their work load and job satisfaction Chapters VI and VII are devoted to the director's responsibilities and to the major problems he faces in student teaching programs. The final chapter draws a composite picture of the characteristics and responsibilities of the director of student teaching.

CHAPTER II

EDUCATIONAL AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

THIS PART of the study summarizes the educational and personal data reported by the 468 directors of student teaching who returned their questionnaires.

Sex

Of the directors responding to the request for information, 66 (14.1 percent) were female; 402 (85.9 percent), male. (See Table 5.) Most of the women worked in private schools; most of the

TABLE 5 SEX OF DIRECTORS

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	402	85.9
Female	66	14.1
Total	468	100.0

men, in institutions supported at public expense. Table 6 shows that 74.3 percent of the women were employed in private institutions; 25.7 percent, in colleges and universities supported financially by the public Of the men, 58.7 percent were employed in publicly supported institutions; 40.8 percent in privately supported colleges and universities.

Age

At the time of the study the youngest director of student teaching was 26 years old; the oldest, 79 years. Table 7 gives data on the age of the directors to their last birthday and when they first became directors of student teaching.

Of the directors, 356 (76 percent) were over 40 years of age when they completed the questionnaire. Only 47 (10 percent)

TABLE 6 NUMBER OF DIRECTORS—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

Sex	Institutional Support: Public		Private		No response		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Men	236	58.7	164	40.8	2	0.5	402	100.0
Women	17	25.7	49	74.3	0	0.0	66	100.0
Total	253	54.1	213	45.5	2	0.0	468	100.0

were past 60. On the average, the women were slightly older than their male counterparts. The mean age for all directors to their last birthday was 47.8 years. For women the mean age was 51.5 years; for men, 47.2 years.

Of the women directors, only 7 (10.6 percent) were less than 41 years of age, while 35 (51.5 percent) were 51 years old or more when they completed the questionnaire. Of the men, 143 (35.2 percent) were 51 or more, and 102 (25.4 percent) were under 41.

Almost one-half of the directors were from 36 to 45 years old when they first became directors of student teaching. The mean age for all directors when they were first employed as directors was 41.9 years. For women, the mean age was 44.2 years; for men, 41.5 years.

Marital Status

Table 8 shows a distribution of directors by sex and marital status. Most of the women (69.7 percent) were single, but most of the men (92.1 percent) were married. Nine (seven men and two women) were widowed; only three were divorced.

Children

Although 15 of the women were married, only four of them had children. Of the men, however, 294 (73.1 percent) had children. The mean number of children for all the men was 1.8; for the women, 0.1.

TABLE 7 AGE OF DIRECTORS—BY SEX

Years of age	When first became director						To last birthday					
	Men	%	Women	%	Total	%	Men	%	Women	%	Total	%
21 - 25	2	0.5	0	-	2	0.4	0	-	0	-	0	-
26 - 30	18	4.5	3	4.5	21	4.5	10	2.5	1	1.5	11	2.4
31 - 35	70	17.5	7	10.6	77	16.5	23	5.7	2	3.0	25	5.4
36 - 40	108	26.9	10	15.2	118	25.2	69	17.2	4	6.1	73	15.6
41 - 45	86	21.4	21	31.8	107	22.9	88	21.9	12	18.2	100	21.4
46 - 50	62	15.5	10	15.2	72	15.4	69	17.2	12	18.2	81	17.3
51 - 55	33	8.2	7	10.6	40	8.5	58	14.5	9	13.6	67	14.3
56 - 60	13	3.2	4	6.1	17	3.6	46	11.5	15	22.7	61	13.0
61 - 65	4	0.9	3	4.5	7	1.5	30	7.5	6	9.1	36	7.7
66 - 70	2	0.5	0	-	2	0.4	6	1.5	3	4.6	9	1.9
71 - 75	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
76 - 80	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	0.2	1	1.5	2	0.4
No response	4	0.9	1	1.5	5	1.1	2	0.5	1	1.5	3	0.6
Mean	41.5		44.2		41.9		47.2		51.5		47.8	

TABLE 8 MARITAL STATUS OF DIRECTORS

Status	Men	%	Women	%	Total	%
Single	21	5.2	46*	69.7	67	14.4
Married	370	92.1	15	22.8	385	82.3
Separated	1	0.2	0	-	1	0.2
Divorced	1	0.2	2	3.0	3	0.6
Widowed	7	0.8	2	3.0	9	1.9
No response	2	0.5	1	1.5	3	0.6
Total	402	99.0	66	100.0	468	100.0

*26 from religious institutions

Table 9 shows the number of children of the responding directors. Of the men who were fathers, 45.5 percent had one or two children, 21.9 percent had three or four children, and 4.9 percent had five or six. Only three men reported having more than six children. Of the women of the study, three had one or two children and one checked the three or four category on the questionnaire.

TABLE 9 CHILDREN OF DIRECTORS

Number of children	Men	%	Women	%	Total	%
0	108	26.9	62	93.9	170	36.3
1 - 2	183	45.5	3	4.6	186	39.8
3 - 4	88	21.9	1	1.5	89	19.0
5 - 6	20	4.9	0	-	20	4.3
7 - 8	3	0.8	0	-	3	0.6
Total	402	100.0	66	100.0	468	100.0
Mean	1.8		0.1			

Educational Preparation

The directors participating in the study were asked to report the level of their college preparation for their positions at the time they completed the questionnaire and when they first became directors of student teaching. (See Table 10.) More than 99.6 percent had a master's or higher degree when they completed the questionnaire. Of the 468 respondents, only two did not have at least a master's. When one considers that only two of five college teachers have doctorates,[3] it is apparent that the directors have an above-average educational background. At the time they responded, 52.4 percent of the directors had the doctor of education degree; 25.4 percent, the doctor of philosophy degree; and 21.4 percent, the master's degree. More men (80.4 percent) than women (62.1 percent) held a doctorate. Yet more women (28.8 percent) than men (24.9 percent) held a Ph.D.

Although 77.8 percent of the directors had doctorates when they completed the questionnaire, only 67.7 percent had completed the degree at the time of their appointment as directors. At that time 28.9 percent of the men and 47 percent of the women had master's degrees, 48.7 percent of the men and 27.3 percent of the women held the doctor of education degree, and 21.9 percent of the men and 22.7 percent of the women had the doctor of philosophy degree.

Table 11 shows that most men—in both private (74.4 percent) and public (84.7 percent) institutions—held doctor's degrees. Of the men from private institutions, 48.8 percent held a doctor of education degree; 25.6 percent, doctor of philosophy degrees. The doctor of education degree was held by 60.6 percent of the men from public institutions; the doctor of philosophy, by 24.1 percent. Only 15.3 percent of the men from public and 23.8 percent from private schools held a master's.

Of the women directors from private institutions, 61 percent had doctorates and 38.8 percent held master's degrees. None of the women directors from either private or public institutions held less than the master's degree. Of all the 468 directors, about four-fifths held the doctorate.

The directors from both public and private institutions held fewer doctorates when they first became directors than when

---

[3]National Education Association, Research Division. *Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1965*. Research Report 1965-R10. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1965, p. 13.

TABLE 10 HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED—BY SEX

	When study conducted						When first appointed as director					
Degree	Men	%	Women	%	Total	%	Men	%	Women	%	Total	%
Bachelor's	2	0.5	-	-	2	0.4	2	0.5	1	1.5	3	0.6
Master's	76	18.9	24	36.4	100	21.4	116	28.9	31	47.0	147	31.5
Doctor of education	223	55.5	22	33.3	245	52.4	196	48.7	18	27.3	214	45.7
Doctor of philosophy	100	24.9	19	28.8	119	25.4	88	21.9	15	22.7	103	22.0
Advanced certificate	1	0.2	1	1.5	2	0.4	0		1	1.5	1	0.1
Total	402		66		468		402		66		468	

TABLE 11 HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	PRIVATE						PUBLIC					
Degree	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
Bachelor's	2	1.2	0	0	2	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Master's	39	23.8	19	38.8	58	27.2	36	15.3	5	29.4	41	16.2
Doctor of education	80	48.8	12	24.5	92	43.2	143	60.6	10	58.8	153	60.5
Doctor of philosophy	42	25.6	18	36.5	60	28.2	57	24.1	1	5.9	58	22.9
Advanced degree	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	1	5.9	1	0.4
Total	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0

they completed the questionnaire. On the average, however, more directors from public institutions held the doctorate than did the directors from private institutions. Table 12 shows the degrees held by the study participants when they first became directors. Of the women, 53.1 percent from private and 35.3 percent from public schools held less than doctor's degrees. Of the men from private and public schools, these percentages were 37.8 percent and 23.3 percent, respectively.

Undergraduate and Graduate Majors

Table 13 shows the undergraduate and graduate majors of the directors of student teaching. In rank order by bachelor's degrees, the directors majored most often in English (19.5 percent), elementary education (16 percent), history (11.8 percent), mathematics (9.6 percent), social studies (7.9 percent), economics (4.3 percent), agriculture (3.8 percent), secondary education (3.2 percent), and chemistry (3.2 percent). The remaining 20.7 percent majored in other subject fields.

At the master's degree level, the respondents majored most often in secondary education and administration (63.3 percent), elementary education (11.8 percent), history (6.7 percent), social studies (1.7 percent), and psychology (1.7 percent). The remaining directors majored in other subject matter fields.

Most of the directors chose doctoral programs that used professional education content as the basic subject matter for the degrees. Only 19 majored in a subject matter field other than professional education. Most of the directors (47.2 percent) obtained doctorates in secondary education and administration. In rank order following this subject field, the directors majored in elementary education, teacher education, counseling education, psychology, and history and philosophy of education.

In Table 14 doctoral majors are shown for both men and women. Of the 40 women reporting who had doctor's degrees, 35 percent majored in secondary education and administration, 25 percent in teacher education, and 17.5 percent in elementary education. (One woman failed to report her doctoral major.)

Of the men, 65.5 percent majored in secondary education and administration, 13.6 percent in elementary education, 10.8 percent in teacher education, and 2.9 percent in counseling.

Table 15 shows the doctoral-level subject matter field of the directors by sex and institutional support. At this level most of

TABLE 12 | DEGREE HELD WHEN BECAME DIRECTOR— BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	PRIVATE						PUBLIC					
Degree	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
Bachelor's	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	1	0.4	1	5.9	2	0.8
Master's	61	37.2	26	53.1	87	40.8	54	22.9	5	29.4	59	23.3
Doctor of Education	69	42.1	9	18.4	78	36.6	127	53.8	9	52.9	136	53.8
Doctor of Philosophy	33	20.1	14	28.5	47	22.1	54	22.9	1	5.9	55	21.7
Advanced degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.9	1	0.4
Total	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0

TABLE 13 UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE MAJORS OF DIRECTORS

Major	Bachelor's degree N	Bachelor's degree %	Master's degree N	Master's degree %	Doctor's degree N	Doctor's degree %
Adult education					1	0.2
Agriculture	18	3.8	1	0.2	1	0.2
Architecture	1	0.2				
Art	1	0.2				
Business education	12	2.6				
Comparative education					1	0.2
Conservation	1	0.2				
Counseling			7	1.5	10	2.2
Elementary education	75	16.0	55	11.8	50	10.7
Engineering	2	0.4				
English	91	19.5	7	1.5	2	0.4
History and philosophy of education	1	0.2	2	0.4	6	1.3
Higher education					3	0.6
Industrial arts	7	1.5	2	0.4	1	0.2
Journalism	2	0.4				
Language:						
French	1	0.2	2	0.4		
German	1	0.2	1	0.2		
Latin	5	1.1	2	0.4		
Mathematics	45	9.6	4	0.9		
Music	8	1.7	3	0.6		
Physical education	10	2.2	7	1.5	4	0.9
Public relations	1	0.2				
Psychology	3	0.6	8	1.7	6	1.3
Science:						
Biology	10	2.2	1	0.2		
Chemistry	15	3.2	2	0.4	1	0.2
General science	8	1.7	1	0.2		
Physics	4	0.9				
Secondary education and administration	15	3.2	296	63.3	221	47.2
Social science:						
Economics	20	4.3	4	0.9		
History	55	11.8	31	6.7	2	0.4
Political science	2	0.4	1	0.2		
Sociology	1	0.2	2	0.4		
Social studies	37	7.9	8	1.7	2	0.4
Speech	3	0.6	1	0.2		
Speech correction			1	0.2		
Special education			1	0.2	1	0.2
Teacher education	1	0.2	5	1.1	44	9.4
No response	12	2.6	13	2.8	112	23.9

TABLE 14 DOCTOR'S DEGREE SUBJECT AREA

	Women		Men	
	N	%	N	%
Agriculture	0	0	1	0.3
Adult education	0	0	1	0.3
Elementary education	7	17.5	43	13.6
Secondary education and administration	14	35.0	207	65.5
English	0	0	2	0.6
Physical education	0	0	4	1.3
Psychology	2	5.0	4	1.3
History	2	5.0	0	0
Counseling	1	2.5	9	2.9
Higher education	2	5.0	1	0.3
Industrial arts	0	0	1	0.3
Teacher education	10	25.0	34	10.8
History and philosophy of education	1	2.5	5	1.6
Comparative education	0	0	1	0.3
Special education	1	2.5	0	0
Chemistry	0	0	1	0.3
Social studies	0	0	2	0.6
Total	40	100.0	316	100.0

the directors from both public and private colleges and universities had majored in subject matter fields closely allied to teacher education. The two subject matter fields — other than secondary education and administration — where a heavy concentration of degrees was noted were elementary and teacher education.

Years of Teaching Experience

The number of years of teaching experience of the directors at various levels of education is shown in Table 16. The mean number of years of college teaching for the responding directors was 10.9. Of the 468 directors, 263 (56.2 percent) had taught 10

TABLE 15 DOCTOR'S DEGREE SUBJECT AREA—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Subject area	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
Agriculture	1	0.8	0	0	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adult education	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	1	0.5
Elementary education	19	15.8	5	18.5	24	16.2	24	12.3	2	15.4	26	12.5
Secondary education	80	66.7	8	29.6	88	59.9	126	64.7	6	46.2	132	63.4
English	2	1.7	0	0	2	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Physical education	3	2.5	0	0	3	2.0	1	0.5	0	0	1	0.5
Psychology	2	1.7	2	7.4	4	2.7	2	1.0	0	0	2	1.0
History	0	0	1	3.7	1	0.7	0	0	1	7.7	1	0.5
Counseling	4	3.3	1	3.7	5	3.4	5	2.6	0	0	5	2.4
Higher education	1	0.8	1	3.7	2	1.4	0	0	1	7.7	1	0.5
Industrial arts	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	1	0.5
Teacher education	2	1.7	7	26.0	9	6.1	32	16.4	3	23.0	35	16.7
History and philosophy of education	4	3.3	1	3.7	5	3.4	1	0.5	0	0	1	0.5
Comparative education	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	1	0.5
Special education	0	0	1	3.7	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chemistry	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	1	0.5
Social studies	2	1.7	0	0	2	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	120	100.0	27	100.0	147	100.0	195	100.0	13	100.0	208	100.0

or fewer years at the college level when they responded to the questionnaire item. An additional 95 (20.3 percent) had taught in college from 16 to 25 years.

Seven of the directors became directors of student teaching without having had any previous teaching experience. These persons were assigned to their student teaching responsibilities during their first year of teaching. However, most (68.6 percent) had taught at least 10 years before becoming directors of student teaching. The mean number of years of teaching experience before becoming a director of student teaching for all directors was 15.9.

Only 1.5 percent of the respondents had never taught in elementary or secondary school before becoming a director of student teaching. Of the directors who taught in precollege-level schools, 20.9 percent had taught from 1 to 5 years, 27.6 percent had taught from 6 to 10 years, and 22.4 percent had taught from 11 to 15 years. Exactly 129 directors (27.5 percent) had more than 15 years of teaching experience in elementary and secondary schools. The mean number of years of precollege experience was 12.2.

Most (84.5 percent) had been a director of student teaching fewer than 11 years. Of the directors, 58.4 percent had served in this capacity from 1 to 5 years and 26.1 percent from 6 to 10 years. Only two of the respondents had served as a director of student teaching over 25 years. The mean number of years served as a director was 6.3.

More than half had not been supervising teachers when they were employed in elementary and secondary schools. An additional 34 percent had served as supervising teachers fewer than six years. As Table 16 shows, only three directors had served in this capacity as long as 21 years. For the 468 directors, the mean length of service as a supervising teacher was 4.9 years.

The average number of years the respondents were employed as college supervisors before becoming directors was 5.2. However, approximately one-third had not served in this capacity before becoming a director of student teaching. Of the respondents, 45.3 percent had from 1 to 5 years experience as college supervisors before becoming directors, 13.3 percent from 6 to 10 years, 3.2 percent from 11 to 15 years, and 2.1 percent had over 15 years of experience as college supervisors.

TABLE 16 TEACHING EXPERIENCE—BY LEVEL

Years of experience	At college level		At precollege level		As director of student teaching		As supervising teacher		College supervisor		Before becoming director of student teaching	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	0	-	7	1.5	0	-	256	54.7	169	36.1	7	1.5
1 - 5	121	25.9	98	20.9	273	58.4	159	34.0	212	45.3	43	9.2
6 - 10	142	30.3	129	27.6	122	26.1	36	7.7	62	13.3	88	18.8
11 - 15	86	18.4	105	22.4	42	8.9	10	2.1	15	3.2	106	22.7
16 - 20	82	17.5	60	12.8	25	5.4	4	0.9	6	1.3	86	18.4
21 - 25	13	2.8	31	6.6	3	0.6	1	0.2	2	0.4	61	13.0
26 - 30	13	2.8	22	4.7	1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2	38	8.1
31 - 35	9	1.9	6	1.3	1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2	13	2.8
36 - 40	2	0.4	6	1.3	0	-	0	-	0	-	13	2.8
41 - 48	0	-	3	0.6	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	0.4
Over 48	0	-	1	0.2	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	0.4
No response	-	-	-	-	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	9	1.9
Total	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0
Mean	10.9		12.2		6.3		4.9		5.2		15.9	

Table 17 shows the years of experience of the men and women at the college level, the precollege level, and before becoming a director of student teaching. Although the women at each level had a slightly greater amount of experience, the differences were not great. At the college level, for example, women averaged 12.4 years of experience compared to 10.7 years for men. At the precollege level and in total teaching experience before becoming directors, the women averaged three more years of experience than their male counterparts.

This additional experience is also evident in Table 18, which gives the years of experience for men and women as supervising teachers, college supervisors, and directors of student teaching. The women in each of these levels averaged from 0.4 to 2 more years of experience.

Table 19 shows the years the directors spent as supervising teachers by sex and by institutional support. On the average there was little appreciable difference between the male directors from both private and public institutions in the years they spent as supervising teachers. For both groups, slightly over one-half had never served in this capacity, while one-third had functioned as supervising teachers from one to five years. Of the women directors, 49 percent of those from private schools and 23.5 percent from public institutions had never been supervising teachers.

Table 20 shows the years the directors served as college supervisors by sex and institutional support. Approximately two-fifths of the men from private and one-third from public colleges and universities had never been college supervisors before becoming directors of student teaching. Of the women, 40.8 percent from private and 41.2 percent from public institutions also had not had prior experience in this capacity. Most directors—both men and women from both types of institutions—had less than six years experience as college supervisors.

Number of Different Directorships

Only two out of ten of the directors in this study had held more than one different directorship. Of the respondents who had been employed as director in two or more institutions, 13.9 percent of the men and 12.1 percent of the women held three directorships. Table 21 shows that only three men and one woman had been employed in four or more different positions.

TABLE 17 TEACHING EXPERIENCE—BY SEX AND LEVEL

Years of experience	At college level				At precollege level				Before becoming director of student teaching			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
None	-	-	-	-	6	1.5	1	1.5	6	1.5	1	1.5
1 - 5	105	26.1	16	24.2	88	21.9	10	15.2	38	9.5	5	7.6
6 - 10	123	30.6	19	28.8	116	28.9	13	19.7	79	19.7	9	13.6
11 - 15	77	19.2	9	13.7	90	22.4	15	22.8	94	23.4	12	18.2
16 - 20	70	17.4	12	18.2	51	12.7	9	13.6	79	19.7	7	10.6
21 - 25	9	2.2	4	6.1	22	5.5	9	13.6	46	11.4	15	22.7
26 - 30	11	2.8	2	3.0	16	3.9	6	9.1	31	7.7	7	10.6
31 - 35	6	1.5	3	4.5	5	1.2	1	1.5	10	2.5	3	4.6
36 - 40	1	0.2	1	1.5	5	1.2	1	1.5	11	2.7	2	3.0
41 - 48	-	-	-	-	3	0.8	0	-	2	0.5	0	-
Over 48	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	1.5	1	0.2	1	1.5
No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	1.2	4	6.1
Mean	10.7		12.4		11.7		14.9		15.6		18.3	

TABLE 18 TEACHING EXPERIENCE AT SUPERVISORY LEVEL—BY SEX

Years of experience	As supervising teacher				As college supervisor				As director of student teaching			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
None	228	56.7	28	42.4	142	35.3	27	40.9	-	-	-	-
1 - 5	137	34.0	22	33.3	189	47.0	23	34.8	240	59.7	33	50.0
6 - 10	27	6.7	9	13.6	52	12.9	10	15.2	105	26.1	17	25.8
11 - 15	7	1.7	3	4.6	11	2.7	4	6.1	33	8.3	9	13.6
16 - 20	1	0.3	3	4.6	4	1.0	2	3.0	18	4.5	7	10.6
21 - 25	1	0.3	0	-	2	0.5	0	-	3	0.8	0	-
26 - 30	0	-	1	1.5	1	0.3	0	-	1	0.3	0	-
31 - 35	1	0.3	0	-	1	0.3	0	-	1	0.3	0	-
No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	0	-
Mean	1.9		3.9		3.2		3.6		6.1		7.2	

TABLE 19 YEARS AS SUPERVISING TEACHER— BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Years	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
0	93	56.7	24	49.0	117	54.9	134	56.8	4	23.5	138	54.5
1 - 5	56	34.1	16	32.7	72	33.8	80	33.9	7	41.2	87	34.4
6 - 10	10	6.2	5	10.2	15	7.0	17	7.2	4	23.5	21	8.3
11 - 15	3	1.8	1	2.0	4	1.9	4	1.7	2	11.8	6	2.4
16 - 20	1	0.6	3	6.1	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
21 - 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
26 - 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31 - 35	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0

TABLE 20 YEARS AS COLLEGE SUPERVISOR—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Years	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
0	69	42.1	20	40.8	89	41.8	72	30.5	7	41.2	79	31.2
1 - 5	70	42.7	19	38.8	89	41.8	118	50.0	4	23.5	122	48.2
6 - 10	17	10.4	6	12.2	23	10.8	35	14.9	4	23.5	39	15.4
11 - 15	4	2.4	2	4.1	6	2.7	7	3.0	2	11.8	9	3.6
16 - 20	2	1.2	2	4.1	4	1.9	2	0.8	0	0	2	0.8
21 - 25	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
26 - 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
31 - 35	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0

TABLE 21 NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DIRECTORSHIPS HELD—BY SEX

Number	Men	%	Women	%	Total	%
1	319	79.4	53	80.3	372	79.5
2	56	13.9	8	12.1	64	13.7
3	24	6.0	4	6.1	28	6.0
4	2	0.5	0		2	0.4
5	0		1	1.5	1	0.2
6	1	0.2	0		1	0.2
Total	402	100	66	100	468	100

TABLE 22 GROSS ANNUAL SALARY

Salary	N	Percent
$2,500 - 3,999	1	0.2
4,000 - 5,499	2	0.4
5,500 - 6,999	7	1.5
7,000 - 8,499	30	6.4
8,500 - 9,999	58	12.4
10,000 - 11,499	85	18.2
11,500 - 12,999	103	22.0
13,000 - 14,499	68	14.5
14,500 - 15,999	48	10.3
16,000 - 17,499	18	3.8
17,500 - 18,999	7	1.5
19,000 - 20,499	5	1.1
20,500 - 21,999	2	0.4
No response	34	7.3
Total	468	100.0

CHAPTER III

SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS

IN A COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS one's standing is often reflected by his economic status. Thus, the salaries and fringe benefits received by the directors of student teaching were also studied in evaluating their overall status.

Gross Annual Salary

The median gross annual salary of the reporting directors was $11,900. The range in reported salaries extended from $2,500 to $21,200. Considerable variations in salary were noted between the salaries of the men and women of the study and between directors from institutions with different financial bases.

Table 22 shows that 2.1 percent of the respondents had gross annual salaries of less than $7,000, and only 3 percent had salaries of $17,000 or more. Of the respondents 12.4 percent reported salaries of from $8,500 to $9,999; 18.2 percent reported salaries of from $10,000 to $11,499; 22 percent from $11,500 to $12,999; 14.5 percent from $13,000 to $14,499; and 10.3 percent from $14,500 to $15,999. Eighteen directors were receiving salaries of from $16,000 to $17,499.

Table 23 shows the gross annual salary of the directors by sex. Using the median salaries, men's salaries averaged $1,680 more than those of the women. The median salary for the women was $10,819; the mean salary, $10,999. The median salary for men was $12,499; the mean salary, $12,218. Of the women directors, only 24.2 percent reported receiving salaries greater than $11,999. For the men, however, 51.6 percent reported salaries of $11,999 or more. Of the women 13.6 percent reported salaries between $12,000 and $13,999; 16.7 percent between $10,000 and $11,999; 13.6 percent between $8,000 and $9,999; and 10.6 percent between $6,000 and $7,999. For the men 29.1 percent received gross salaries of from $12,000 to $13,999; 25.4 percent were receiving salaries of from $10,000 to $11,999. Salaries of

TABLE 23 GROSS ANNUAL SALARY—BY SEX

Salary	Women N	Women %	Men N	Men %
$ 2,000 - 3,999	-	-	1	0.2
4,000 - 5,999	2	3.0	1	0.2
6,000 - 7,999	7	10.6	18	4.5
8,000 - 9,999	9	13.6	60	14.9
10,000 - 11,999	11	16.7	102	25.4
12,000 - 13,999	9	13.6	117	29.1
14,000 - 15,999	4	6.1	61	15.2
16,000 - 17,999	1	1.5	20	4.9
18,000 - 19,999	1	1.5	4	1.2
20,000 - 21,999	1	1.5	5	1.2
No response	21	31.9	13	3.2
Total	66	100.0	402	100.0
Mean	10,999		12,218	
Median	10,819		12,499	

from $8,000 to $9,999 were paid to 14.9 percent of the men; $14,000 to $15,999, to 15.2 percent.

Table 6, in Chapter II, shows the number of directors by sex and institutional support. Data from this table become more meaningful in Table 24, where the ranges in directors' salaries are reported by rank, institutional support, and sex. Salary ranges for male professors in both private and public institutions extended from $6,000 to $21,999. For women holding this rank, the range was from $10,000 to $21,999 in institutions with public financial backing and from $6,000 to $15,999 in private colleges and universities. For the directors holding professorships in public institutions, most received salaries from $10,000 to $17,999, while private school directors received from $8,000 to $13,999.

Salary ranges for associate professors also favored directors from public institutions. Of the directors from public institutions, most received salaries of from $10,000 to $15,999, while most associate professors reporting from private institutions received salaries in the $8,000 to $13,999 range. Of the assistant

TABLE 24 RANGE IN SALARIES-BY INSTITUTIONAL FINANCING, SEX, AND RANK

Salary range	Public										Private									
	Professor		Associate professor		Assistant professor		Instructor		No response		Professor		Associate professor		Assistant professor		Instructor		No response	
	M %	W %	M %	W %	M %	W %	M %	W %	M %	W %	M %	W %	M %	W %	M %	W %	M %	W %	M %	W %
$ 2,000 - 3,999	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
$ 4,000 - 5,999	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
$ 6,000 - 7,999	1	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	2	4	2	5	2	1	2	-	-
$ 8,000 - 9,999	1	-	4	-	10	-	1	-	-	-	11	5	17	2	14	2	2	-	-	-
$10,000 - 11,999	15	2	23	4	16	-	-	-	-	-	18	4	21	1	5	-	-	-	-	-
$12,000 - 13,999	44	3	21	1	12	-	1	-	-	-	17	1	13	2	2	1	-	-	-	-
$14,000 - 15,999	33	3	14	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	9	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
$16,000 - 17,999	15	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
$18,000 - 19,999	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
$20,000 - 21,999	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No response	0	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	14	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	21
Total	115	10	64	5	40	-	3	-	14	2	65	13	57	7	27	6	5	2	10	21

Note: 18 nuns reported no pay; 7 nuns reported pay.

professors, salaries in private institutions ranged from $6,000 to $15,999. Of the women respondents from private schools, 18 nuns reported no pay.

Table 25 includes the median salaries of the directors by sex, rank, and institutional financing. Use of median salaries in this table shows more clearly the salary differences that favored directors from public institutions. For each rank, where comparisons were possible, men and women directors from publicly financed colleges and universities averaged greater salaries.

For full professor, male directors from publicly financed institutions averaged $1,680 more; for women, the average difference was $4,150. For associate professors this difference for men was $2,000 and for women $1,400. At the assistant professor and instructor levels, comparisons could only be made among the salaries of the male directors. These comparisons favored director from institutions with public financial backing by $1,625 and $2,500, respectively.

Other Salary Factors

When asked whether they were paid on an academic or fiscal year basis, 349 (74.5 percent) of the directors answered academic year basis. Of the directors reporting an academic year pay period, 202 (57.9 percent) received extra pay for the first summer period and 81 (23.2 percent) for the second summer period. Of the 468 directors, 62 (13.2 percent) received extension pay.

Fringe Benefits

Directors of student teaching also listed their fringe benefits. (See Table 26.) Social Security was the most common fringe benefit: 78.6 percent reporting it. Except for Social Security and sabbatical leave (listed as a benefit by 54.5 percent), no other fringe benefit was reported by more than half of the directors.

The data on supplementary benefits in Table 26 are also used in Tables 27 and 28, where they are reported by sex and institutional support. These data show that the supplementary benefits included as a part of this study were more often available to private school respondents than to those from public institutions. These last two tables show that directors from private institutions registered more "no" responses to only three categories—state retirement, sabbatical leave, and other benefits. On the other hand, many directors from public colleges and universities reported that their schools had no Social Security, school retire-

TABLE 25 MEDIAN SALARIES—BY INSTITUTIONAL FINANCING, SEX, AND RANK

Rank	Public				Private			
	Men		Women		Men		Women	
	N	Median Salary	N	Median Salary	N	Median Salary	N	Median Salary
Professor	115	$13,680	10	$13,550	65	$12,000	13	$9,400
Associate professor	64	$12,200	5	$10,600	57	$10,200	7	$9,200
Assistant professor	40	$11,000	-	-	27	$9,375	6	$7,900
Instructor	3	$9,900	-	-	5	$7,400	2	$6,750
Incomplete information	14		2	-	10	-	21	
Total	236		17		164		49	

ment, paid life insurance, paid medical, or reduced college rate programs.

When the women in the study are compared separately, however, most of those from private schools also registered negative responses to the supplementary benefit of reduced college fees.

TABLE 26 SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFITS

Benefits	No	Percent	Yes	Percent
State retirement	256	54.7	212	45.3
Social Security	100	21.4	368	78.6
School retirement	251	53.6	217	46.4
Sabbatical leave	213	45.5	255	54.5
Paid life insurance	281	60.0	187	40.0
Paid medical insurance	260	55.6	208	44.4
Reduced college fees	281	60.0	187	40.0
Other	463	98.9	5	1.1

TABLE 27 SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFITS—PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Benefits	Male (N=164)				Female (N=49)				Total (N=213)			
	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%
State retirement	162	98.8	2	1.2	47	95.9	2	4.1	209	88.1	4	1.9
Social Security	17	10.4	147	89.6	24	49.0	25	51.0	41	19.2	172	81.8
School retirement	26	15.9	138	84.1	31	63.3	18	36.7	57	26.8	156	73.2
Sabbatical leave	71	43.3	93	56.7	29	59.2	20	40.8	100	46.9	113	53.1
Paid life insurance	74	45.1	90	54.9	33	67.3	16	32.7	107	50.2	106	49.8
Paid medical insurance	65	39.6	99	60.4	28	57.1	21	42.9	93	43.7	120	56.3
Reduced college fees	31	18.9	133	81.1	39	79.6	10	20.4	70	32.9	143	67.1
Other	164	100.0	0	0	48	98.0	1	2.0	212	99.5	1	0.5

TABLE 28 SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFITS—PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

	Male (N = 236)				Female (N = 17)				Total (N = 253)			
State retirement	43	18.2	193	81.8	3	17.6	14	82.4	46	18.2	207	81.8
Social Security	53	22.5	183	77.5	6	35.3	11	64.7	59	23.3	194	76.0
School retirement	180	76.3	56	23.7	14	82.4	3	17.6	194	76.7	59	23.3
Sabbatical leave	104	44.1	132	55.9	7	41.2	10	58.8	111	43.9	142	56.1
Paid life insurance	159	67.4	77	32.6	14	82.4	3	17.6	173	68.4	80	31.5
Paid medical insurance	153	64.8	83	35.2	13	76.5	4	23.5	166	65.6	87	34.4
Reduced college fees	196	83.1	40	16.9	13	76.5	4	23.5	209	82.6	44	17.4
Other	232	98.3	4	1.7	17	100.0	0	0	249	98.4	4	1.6

CHAPTER IV

WORK LOAD

THE WORK LOAD OF a director of student teaching may have considerable effect on his satisfaction with the job and on his ability to perform his various responsibilities adequately. This chapter considers such work load factors as the directors' instructional and noninstructional activities, publications, and membership in professional committees and groups.

Noninstructional Activities

Table 29 shows the time spent by the directors in noninstructional activities, including hours per week spent on directing student teaching, public service, and other administrative activities. Column 2 shows how much time was spent on director of student teaching responsibilities. Of the respondents, nearly 16 percent spent from 1 to 5 hours per week directing student teaching; 20.1 percent, from 6 to 10 hours; 11.8 percent from 11 to 15 hours; and 15.6 percent, from 16 to 20 hours. The mean number of hours per week spent on directing student teaching was 16.9.

Three-fourths of the directors were involved in activities requiring administrative decisions in addition to those in student teaching. Most of these directors (31.6 percent) spent from 1 to 5 hours per week in other administrative activities. Of the remainder, 21.4 percent spent from 6 to 10 hours; 8.6 percent, from 11 to 15 hours; and 7.7 percent, from 16 to 20 hours. About 27 percent of the respondents did not indicate whether or not they had other administrative responsibilities.

Two-thirds of the directors reported advisement responsibilities other than those in student teaching. Of those reporting, 47 percent advised less than six hours per week. Only 3.2 percent of all the directors were involved in an advisory capacity for more than ten hours per week.

One-half of the directors included such public service activities as presenting speeches and consulting. Of these directors,

TABLE 29 NONINSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Hours per week	Directing student teaching		Other administrative duties		Other advisement duties		Public service		Sponsored research		Individual research		Other	
No.	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	74	15.8	148	31.6	220	47.0	226	48.3	37	7.9	140	29.9	62	13.3
6 - 10	94	20.1	100	21.4	73	15.6	16	3.4	9	1.9	24	5.1	30	6.4
11 - 15	55	11.8	40	8.6	8	1.7	2	0.4	0	-	1	0.2	13	2.8
16 - 20	73	15.6	36	7.7	7	1.5	0	-	0	-	5	1.1	6	1.3
21 - 25	40	8.6	8	1.7	0	-	1	0.2	0	-	1	0.2	3	0.6
26 - 30	53	11.3	3	0.6	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	0.2
31 - 35	14	2.9	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
36 - 40	21	4.5	3	0.6	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
41 - 45	7	1.5	1	0.2	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
46 - 50	10	2.1	2	0.4	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
No response	27	5.8	127	27.2	160	34.2	223	47.7	422	90.2	297	63.5	353	75.4
Total	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0
Mean	16.9		8.6		4.8		3.5		3.9		4.3		6.9	

almost 48.3 percent devoted five or fewer hours of their time to such activity. Only one director served in a consulting capacity for more than 20 hours per week.

Not all directors were involved in research—only 9.8 percent participated in sponsored research projects. Of the 36.5 percent conducting individual research projects, 140 (29.9 percent) spent from 1 to 5 hours per week on this activity; 5.1 percent, from 6 to 10 hours.

An additional 24.6 percent were involved in various other noninstructional activities. Over half of the directors reporting other noninstructional activities spent fewer than 6 hours per week in these activities.

Table 30 shows the hours per week devoted to director of student teaching duties by sex and by institutional support. Almost two-thirds of the private school respondents devoted fewer than 16 hours per week to director of student teaching duties; slightly less than 35 percent of those from public institutions devoted fewer than 16 hours per week to this responsibility. Over 30 hours per week directing student teaching activities was spent by 17.4 percent of the representatives of public institutions and by 3.8 percent of those from private colleges. Of all the women and men of the study, most of those from private colleges and universities spent fewer hours on directorship duties.

In addition to their responsibilities as directors of student teaching, the respondents spent varied amounts of time on other administrative acts. Table 31 shows the hours per week spent on these administrative responsibilities: 52.6 percent from private and 52.9 percent from public institutions spent fewer than 11 hours per week on these other duties; only 2.8 percent and 4.4 percent, respectively, spent more than 20 hours per week. Most of the women directors from public institutions (35.3 percent), compared to those from private institutions (26.6 percent), spent from one to five hours per week in other administrative activities. However, 26.8 percent from private and 27.7 percent from public institutions having no other administrative responsibilities. The percentage of men who spent different amounts of time each week in other administrative roles did not differ greatly for any of the categories.

Table 32 shows the number of hours per week the respondents were involved in other advisement duties by sex and by institu-

TABLE 30 TIME DEVOTED TO DIRECTOR OF STUDENT TEACHING DUTIES—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	39	23.8	14	28.6	53	24.8	19	8.1	2	11.8	21	8.3
6 - 10	46	28.1	11	22.4	57	26.8	36	15.3	1	5.9	37	14.6
11 - 15	22	13.4	4	8.2	26	12.2	27	11.4	2	11.8	29	11.5
16 - 20	21	12.8	4	8.2	25	11.7	44	18.6	3	17.6	47	18.7
21 - 25	10	6.1	0	0	10	4.7	26	11.0	4	23.4	30	11.9
26 - 30	13	7.9	3	6.1	16	7.5	35	14.8	1	5.9	36	14.2
31 - 35	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	13	5.5	0	0	13	5.1
36 - 40	0	0	4	8.2	4	1.9	16	6.8	1	5.9	17	6.7
41 - 45	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3.0	0	0	7	2.8
46 - 50	3	1.8	0	0	3	1.4	6	2.5	1	5.9	7	2.8
No response	9	5.5	9	18.3	18	8.5	7	3.0	2	11.8	9	4.4
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	155	94.5	40	81.7	195	91.5	229	97.0	15	88.2	242	95.6

TABLE 31 TIME DEVOTED TO OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	52	31.7	13	26.6	65	30.5	76	32.2	6	35.3	82	32.4
6 - 10	35	21.4	12	24.5	47	22.1	49	20.8	3	17.6	52	20.5
11 - 15	19	11.6	3	6.2	22	10.3	17	7.2	1	5.9	18	7.1
16 - 20	15	9.1	1	2.0	16	7.5	18	7.6	2	11.8	20	7.9
21 - 25	1	0.6	1	2.0	2	0.9	6	7.6	0	0	6	2.4
26 - 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.3	0	0	3	1.2
31 - 35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
36 - 40	3	1.8	0	0	3	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
41 - 45	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
46 - 50	0	0	1	2.0	1	0.5	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
No response	39	23.8	18	36.7	57	26.8	65	27.5	5	29.4	70	27.7
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	125	76.2	31	63.3	156	73.2	171	72.5	12	70.6	183	72.3

TABLE 32 TIME DEVOTED TO OTHER ADVISEMENT DUTIES—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	85	51.8	23	46.9	108	50.7	105	44.5	5	29.4	110	43.5
6 - 10	28	17.1	2	4.1	30	14.1	51	21.6	2	11.8	53	20.9
11 - 15	6	3.7	0	0	6	2.8	2	0.8	0	0	2	0.8
16 - 20	5	3.0	1	2.0	6	2.8	-	-	1	5.9	1	0.4
21 - 25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26 - 30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31 - 35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36 - 40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
41 - 45	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
46 - 50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No response	40	24.4	23	47.0	63	29.6	78	33.1	9	52.9	87	34.4
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	124	75.6	26	53.0	150	70.4	158	66.9	8	47.1	166	65.6

tional support. Of the directors, 24.4 percent of the men and 47 percent of the women from private institutions spent no time in this activity; 33.1 percent of the men and 52.9 percent of the women from public colleges and universities were also freed from such duties. Of the remaining men, 68.9 percent from private and 66.1 percent from public colleges spent 10 or fewer hours in this activity. Of the remaining women, only two spent more than 10 hours in other advisement roles.

Table 33 shows the hours per week the directors were involved in public service activities. Of the directors, 44.1 percent from private colleges and 59.3 percent from public institutions reported public service activities in addition to their student teaching responsibilities. Most of both the male and female private and public institutional representatives spent fewer than six hours per week in public service activities.

Table 34 shows the directors' involvement in sponsored research projects by sex and by institutional support: only 8 percent from private institutions; 11.5 percent from public colleges. Only two women directors (both from private institutions) reported this activity. Only eight men (two from private and six from public institutions) spent more than five hours per week in this activity.

Table 35 includes individual research activities by sex and by institutional support. Most of the directors from both public and private institutions spent fewer than six hours per week on such research. Only two public and four private female institutional representatives participated in individual research six or more hours per week. Only 7.3 percent of the men from private colleges and 5.5 percent from public schools were concerned with individual research six or more hours per week.

Table 36 shows the number and percentage of directors of student teaching who reported other noninstructional duties. One-fourth of each sex from both private and public institutions reported such activities.

Instructional Activities

Table 37 shows that in addition to their administrative and research activities a number of directors were also required to teach classes. Only 21.2 percent were completely relieved of this responsibility. Of the directors teaching on campus, 34.8 percent taught from six to ten hours per week and 31 percent from one to five hours. Two directors reported on-campus teaching loads

TABLE 33 TIME DEVOTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	71	43.3	14	28.6	85	39.9	133	56.4	7	41.2	140	55.3
6 - 10	7	4.3	1	2.0	8	3.7	8	3.4	0	0	8	3.2
11 - 15	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
16 - 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21 - 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
No response	85	51.8	34	69.4	119	55.9	93	39.4	10	58.8	103	40.7
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	79	48.2	15	30.6	94	44.1	143	60.6	7	41.2	150	59.3

TABLE 34 TIME DEVOTED TO SPONSORED RESEARCH—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	13	7.9	1	2.0	14	6.6	23	9.8	0	0	23	9.1
6 - 10	2	1.2	1	2.0	3	1.4	6	2.5	0	0	6	2.4
No response	149	90.9	47	96.0	196	92.0	207	87.7	17	100.0	224	88.5
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	15	9.1	2	4.0	17	8.0	29	12.3	0	0	29	11.5

TABLE 35 TIME DEVOTED TO INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	39	23.8	7	14.3	46	21.5	89	37.7	5	29.4	94	37.2
6 - 10	11	6.7	3	6.1	14	6.6	9	3.8	1	5.9	10	3.9
11 - 15	0	0	1	2.0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 - 20	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	3	1.3	1	5.9	4	1.6
21 - 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
No response	113	68.9	38	77.6	151	70.9	134	56.8	10	58.8	144	56.9
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	51	31.1	11	22.4	62	29.1	102	43.2	7	41.2	109	43.1

TABLE 36 TIME DEVOTED TO OTHER DUTIES—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	19	11.6	5	10.2	24	11.2	35	14.9	3	17.6	38	15.0
6 - 10	9	5.5	4	8.2	13	6.1	16	6.8	1	5.9	17	6.7
11 - 15	6	3.7	1	2.0	7	3.3	6	2.5	0	0	6	2.4
16 - 20	2	1.2	0	0	2	0.9	4	1.7	0	0	4	1.6
21 - 25	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	2	0.8	0	0	2	0.8
26 - 30	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	126	76.8	39	79.6	165	77.5	173	73.3	13	76.5	186	73.5
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	38	23.2	10	20.4	48	22.5	63	26.7	4	23.5	67	26.5

TABLE 37 INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Hours per week	Teaching on campus		Extension teaching		Supervising student teaching		Other (theses, etc.)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	145	31.0	60	12.8	61	13.0	132	28.2
6 - 10	163	34.8	11	2.4	105	22.5	30	6.5
11 - 15	38	8.1	1	0.2	54	11.5	2	0.4
16 - 20	16	3.4	3	0.6	50	10.7	3	0.6
21 - 25	5	1.1	0	-	10	2.1	2	0.4
26 - 30	2	0.4	0	-	5	1.1	1	0.2
31 - 35	0	-	0	-	2	0.4	0	-
No response	99	21.2	393	84.0	181	38.7	298	63.7
Total	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0
Mean	7.3		4.5		10.7		4.6	

of from 26 to 30 hours in addition to their directorship duties.

Asked whether they taught a course in supervision of the student teacher, 154 (32.9 percent) of the directors said "yes"; 314 (67.1 percent) reported they did not.

Extension class teaching involved fewer than one-fifth of the directors. Of the respondents involved in teaching extension classes, four-fifths spent from one to five hours on this activity. Fifteen percent of the remainder were involved in extension class teaching from six to ten hours per week.

Three-fifths of the respondents were personally involved in supervising student teachers. Of the directors functioning as college supervisors, 13 percent spent 1 to 5 hours per week supervising student teachers; 22.5 percent, 6 to 10 hours per week; 11.5 percent, 11 to 15 hours; and 10.7 percent, 16 to 20 hours per week. Only 17 spent over 20 hours per week supervising student teachers.

Approximately one-third of the directors were involved in other instructional activities, such as helping students with master's theses and doctoral dissertations. Most (95 percent) spent fewer than 11 hours a week in this type of activity.

Table 38 shows how many hours per week were spent in on-campus teaching by sex and by institutional support. The percentage of those reporting no on-campus teaching responsibilities was small: only 13.6 percent from private schools and 27.7 percent from publicly supported institutions. Of the women 67.4 percent from private institutions and 64.7 percent from public colleges spent 10 or fewer hours in on-campus teaching. Approximately four-fifths of the men from both private and public institutions who reported on-campus teaching were assigned load responsibilities of 10 or fewer hours per week.

Table 39 shows the extension class teaching loads of the directors by sex and by institutional support. Only a few were involved in this type of teaching. Of all the directors, the men from public institutions (22 percent) and men from private colleges (12.1 percent) most often taught extension classes.

More directors from private colleges and universities (70 percent) were held responsible for supervising teachers than were those from public institutions (53.8 percent). Table 40 shows the number of hours per week spent in supervising student teachers by sex and by institutional support. Of the men, 45.8 percent from publicly supported colleges and 26.8 percent from private institutions did not have this duty. Of the women, 59.2 percent from private institutions and 47.1 percent from public colleges supervised student teachers.

Table 41 shows the number of hours per week the directors spent in instructional activities other than those noted previously in this section. Only 33.3 percent of the directors from privately supported institutions and 38.7 percent of those from public colleges reported other instructional activities.

Nonprofessional Assistants

Table 42 shows the number and percentage of directors of student teaching aided by nonprofessional secretarial assistants. About one-fifth of the directors had full-time secretarial aid; another one-fifth had part-time secretaries. Student secretarial help alone was available to 14.5 percent of the directors. Nineteen directors (4.1 percent of those reporting) were assisted by both full-time and part-time secretaries, while 95 (20.3 percent) reported both full-time and student secretarial assistance. Sixty-one respondents (13.1 percent) had both part-time and student

TABLE 38 TIME DEVOTED TO ON-CAMPUS TEACHING—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	46	28.0	16	32.7	62	29.1	74	31.3	7	41.2	81	32.0
6 - 10	72	43.9	17	34.7	89	41.9	70	29.7	4	23.5	74	29.2
11 - 15	16	9.8	5	10.2	21	9.8	15	6.4	2	11.8	17	6.7
16 - 20	6	3.7	1	2.0	7	3.3	9	3.8	0	0	9	3.6
21 - 25	3	1.8	0	0	3	1.4	2	0.8	0	0	2	0.8
26 - 30	1	0.6	1	2.0	2	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	20	12.2	9	18.4	29	13.6	66	28.0	4	23.5	70	27.7
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	144	87.8	40	81.6	184	86.4	170	72.0	13	76.5	183	72.3

TABLE 39 TIME DEVOTED TO EXTENSION TEACHING—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	12	7.3	2	4.1	14	6.6	45	19.1	1	5.9	46	18.1
6 - 10	5	3.0	0	0	5	2.3	6	2.5	0	0	6	2.4
11 - 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
16 - 20	3	1.8	0	0	3	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	144	87.9	47	95.9	191	89.7	184	78.0	16	94.1	200	79.1
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	20	12.1	2	4.1	22	10.3	52	22.0	1	5.9	53	20.9

TABLE 40 TIME DEVOTED TO SUPERVISING STUDENT TEACHING—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	27	16.5	6	12.3	33	15.6	26	11.0	1	5.9	27	10.7
6 - 10	48	29.3	11	22.5	59	27.7	43	18.2	3	17.6	46	18.1
11 - 15	24	14.6	8	16.3	32	15.0	20	8.5	1	5.9	21	8.3
16 - 20	17	10.4	3	6.1	20	9.4	28	11.9	2	11.8	30	11.9
21 - 25	2	1.2	1	2.0	3	1.4	6	2.5	1	5.9	7	2.8
26 - 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2.1	0	0	5	2.0
31 - 35	2	1.2	0	0	2	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	44	26.8	20	40.8	64	30.0	108	45.8	9	52.9	117	46.2
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	120	73.2	29	59.2	149	70.0	128	54.2	8	47.1	136	53.8

TABLE 41 TIME DEVOTED TO OTHER ACTIVITIES—BY SEX AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

	Private						Public					
Hours per week	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1 - 5	45	27.4	7	14.3	52	24.4	76	32.2	3	17.6	79	31.2
6 - 10	11	6.7	4	8.2	15	7.0	14	5.9	1	5.9	15	5.9
11 - 15	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
16 - 20	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.5	2	0.9	0	0	2	0.8
21 - 25	0	0	2	4.0	2	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
26 - 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.4
No response	106	64.7	36	73.5	142	67.7	142	60.2	13	76.5	155	61.3
N =	164	100.0	49	100.0	213	100.0	236	100.0	17	100.0	253	100.0
Answered	58	35.3	13	26.5	71	33.3	94	39.8	4	23.5	98	38.7

TABLE 42 NONPROFESSIONAL ASSISTANTS

Type of assistant	N	Percent
None	45	9.6
Full-time	80	17.1
Part-time	83	17.7
Student	68	14.5
Full-time and part-time	19	4.1
Full-time and student	95	20.3
Part-time and student	61	13.1
Full-time, part-time, and student	17	3.6
Total	468	100.0

secretarial assistance. Only 3.6 percent of the directors had full-time, part-time, and student secretarial assistants.

Professional Assistants

The number and percentage of the directors of student teaching aided by professional assistants are shown in Table 43. Only 2.8 percent of all the directors had full-time assistant directors of student teaching. An additional 15.4 percent had part-time assistant directors working with them.

Most of the directors worked in institutions that did not use area coordinators. Table 43 shows that only 7 percent of the respondents had area coordinators assisting them. Of the directors reporting this type of assistant, 9 were assisted by full-time area coordinators and 24 by part-time coordinators. Eleven directors were assisted by both area coordinators and by assistant directors of student teaching.

Table 43 shows that approximately four-fifths of the directors were assisted by college supervisors. For the most part, the directors reported that the college supervisors handled responsibilities in addition to their student teacher supervisory duties.

TABLE 43 PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANTS

	Assistant director		Area coordinator		College supervisor	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Full-time	13	2.8	9	1.9	29	6.2
Part-time	72	15.4	24	5.1	345	73.7
No response	383	81.8	435	93.0	94	20.1
Total	468	100.0	468	100.0	468	100.0

Publications

One additional work load consideration was the responsibility of publishing books and journal articles. When asked whether it was necessary to "publish or perish" for promotion purposes, almost 75 percent of the directors said that authoring publications was not necessary for promotion. Of the remaining directors, 13 percent were not certain and 12 percent were certain that authoring publications was necessary for promotion.

Although most of the directors did not feel that it was necessary to publish materials, a number of them did write for publication. In all, 263 (56.2 percent) directors had written published journal articles and 79 (16.9 percent) had written books that had been published.

Professional Groups and Committees

The directors in this study participated in a number of different professional groups. Table 44 shows that only 1.9 percent of the directors did not belong to any professional group. The remaining 98.1 percent belonged to two or more groups.

Table 45 shows the number of committees to which the directors were assigned. Most of the directors (86.2 percent) were on from one to five different committees. No committee assignments were given to 6.8 percent of the directors; the remaining 7 percent had committee assignments numbering from six to ten. The mean number of committee assignments was 2.9.

TABLE 44 PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

	N	Percent
None	9	1.9
1	0	-
2	15	3.2
3	53	11.3
4	83	17.7
5	118	25.3
6	83	17.7
7	49	10.5
8	31	6.6
9	8	1.7
More than 9	19	4.1
Total	468	100.0

TABLE 45 COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Number of committees	N	Percent
None	32	6.8
1	47	10.1
2	101	21.6
3	148	31.6
4	73	15.6
5	34	7.3
6	16	3.4
7	12	2.6
8	2	0.4
9	0	-
10	3	0.6
Total	468	100.0
Mean	2.95	

CHAPTER V

JOB SATISFACTION

AS A PART OF THIS STUDY the directors of student teaching were asked to rate 13 items dealing with job satisfaction. These categories were considered to be those which influence the director's feeling in the day-to-day task of administering the program. Table 46 shows the responses of the directors to questions about their satisfaction with their jobs.

As a group all the directors were content with the policy of ranking in practice at their institutions. Only 6.4 percent were not satisfied. Part A in Table 46 shows that one out of two directors were very satisfied with the policy of ranking. This response held true for directors in public and private institutions, as well as for female and male directors.

The policy of ranking for college supervisors was reported to be satisfactory or very satisfactory by 85.5 percent of the directors. This was approximately the same for directors in public and private institutions. Part B of Table 46 shows that although four out of five directors were satisfied, 10.3 percent of the directors in public institutions were not. Considering that only 7.5 percent of all the directors were not satisfied, it seems that, as seen by directors, college supervisors have a most satisfactory policy of ranking.

In Part C the data on salary policy for the directors reveal that 15.4 percent were not satisfied with it; 79.1 percent were satisfied. Of the directors, only 30.8 percent were very satisfied.

The directors of student teaching reported that the salary policy for college supervisors was quite satisfactory. Part D shows that 55.1 percent of the directors said college supervisors' salaries were satisfactory and 24.6 percent said they were very satisfactory.

The willingness of an institution to support a quality student teaching program is reported in Part E. The directors of student teaching felt that institutions of higher education were willing to support a quality student teaching program. Part E shows that

TABLE 46 JOB SATISFACTION

Job description	Degree of satisfaction	All directors		Private institutions		Public institutions		Male		Female	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	1	247	52.8	108	50.7	138	54.5	213	53.3	33	50.0
Rank policy for	2	169	36.1	79	37.1	89	35.2	146	36.5	22	33.3
directors of student	3	24	5.1	10	4.7	14	5.5	21	5.2	3	4.6
teaching	4	6	1.3	2	0.9	4	1.6	5	1.3	1	1.5
	5	22	4.7	14	6.6	8	3.2	15	3.7	7	10.6
B	1	195	41.7	89	41.8	104	41.1	164	41.0	29	44.0
	2	205	43.8	93	43.7	112	44.3	179	44.7	26	39.4
Rank policy for	3	30	6.4	7	3.3	23	9.1	27	6.7	3	4.5
college supervisors	4	5	1.1	2	0.9	3	1.2	5	1.3	0	0
	5	33	7.0	22	10.3	11	4.3	25	6.3	8	12.1
C	1	144	30.8	56	26.3	88	34.8	122	30.5	22	33.3
	2	226	48.3	110	51.6	115	45.4	201	50.3	24	36.3
Salary policy for the	3	57	12.2	27	12.7	29	11.5	51	12.7	5	7.6
director of student	4	15	3.2	4	1.9	11	4.3	11	2.7	4	6.1
teaching	5	26	5.5	16	7.5	10	4.0	15	3.8	11	16.7
D	1	115	24.6	53	24.9	62	24.5	95	23.8	20	30.3
	2	258	55.1	110	51.6	147	58.1	232	58.0	25	37.9
Salary policy for	3	46	9.8	21	9.9	24	9.5	39	9.7	6	9.1
college supervisors	4	12	2.6	3	1.4	9	3.6	10	2.5	2	3.0
	5	37	7.9	26	12.2	11	4.3	24	6.0	13	19.7
E	1	176	37.6	88	41.4	87	34.3	142	35.5	33	50.0
	2	227	48.5	97	45.5	130	51.4	201	50.3	26	39.4
Willingness of institution	3	42	9.0	17	8.0	24	9.5	39	9.7	2	3.0
to support a quality	4	11	2.3	5	2.3	6	2.4	10	2.5	1	1.5
student teaching program	5	12	2.6	6	2.8	6	2.4	8	2.0	4	6.1
F	1	335	71.6	147	69.0	186	73.5	288	72.0	45	68.2
	2	107	22.9	54	25.4	53	20.9	92	23.0	15	22.7
Director's relations	3	5	1.1	0	0	5	2.0	5	1.7	0	0
with college supervisors	4	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.4	1	0.3	0	0
	5	20	4.2	12	5.6	8	3.2	14	3.5	6	9.1

*Where 1 = very satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory, 3 = unsatisfactory, 4 = very unsatisfactory, 5 = no response

TABLE 46 (Continued)

Job description	Degree of satisfaction	All directors		Private institutions		Public institutions		Male		Female	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
G	1	338	72.2	151	70.8	185	73.1	288	72.0	48	72.7
	2	112	23.9	54	25.4	58	22.9	96	24.0	16	24.3
Director's relations	3	4	0.9	0	0	4	1.6	4	1.0	0	0
with college (division)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
of education personnel	5	14	3.0	8	3.8	6	2.4	12	3.0	2	3.0
H	1	222	47.5	110	51.6	112	44.2	188	47.0	34	51.5
	2	221	47.2	95	44.6	124	49.0	191	47.8	28	42.4
Director's relations	3	10	2.1	1	0.5	9	3.6	10	2.5	0	0
with personnel from	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other colleges or divisions	5	15	3.2	7	3.3	8	3.2	11	2.7	4	6.1
I	1	203	42.4	90	42.3	112	44.2	179	44.7	23	34.9
	2	205	43.8	102	47.9	103	40.7	173	43.3	32	48.5
Fairness of distribution	3	49	10.5	17	8.0	31	12.3	41	10.3	7	10.6
of duties to directors	4	4	0.8	2	0.9	2	0.8	3	0.7	1	1.5
	5	7	1.5	2	0.9	5	2.0	4	1.0	3	4.5
J	1	141	30.1	62	29.2	78	30.8	123	30.8	17	25.8
	2	202	43.2	101	47.4	101	39.9	167	41.7	35	53.1
Director's teaching	3	101	21.6	41	19.2	60	23.7	89	22.3	12	18.1
and administrative	4	16	3.4	6	2.8	9	3.6	15	3.7	0	0
load	5	8	1.7	3	1.4	5	2.0	6	1.5	2	3.0
K	1	152	32.5	64	30.1	87	34.3	133	33.3	18	27.3
	2	190	40.6	98	46.0	92	36.4	161	40.1	29	43.9
Number of student	3	54	11.5	28	13.1	26	10.3	47	11.8	7	10.6
teacher assigned to	4	15	3.2	7	3.3	7	2.8	12	3.0	2	3.0
director	5	57	12.2	16	7.5	41	16.2	47	11.8	10	15.2
L	1	215	45.9	83	39.0	132	52.1	189	47.2	26	39.4
	2	191	40.8	98	46.0	92	36.4	165	41.3	25	37.8
Transportation policy	3	34	7.3	20	9.4	13	5.1	28	7.0	5	7.6
for director	4	13	2.8	6	2.8	7	2.8	8	2.0	5	7.6
	5	15	3.2	6	2.8	9	3.6	10	2.5	5	7.6
M	1	214	45.9	94	44.1	121	47.8	185	46.3	30	45.5
	2	234	50.0	116	54.5	117	46.2	200	50.0	33	50.0
Director's position	3	13	2.8	2	0.9	10	4.0	10	2.5	2	3.0
as a whole	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	5	6	1.3	1	0.5	5	2.0	5	1.2	1	1.5

86.1 percent were satisfied or very satisfied. Only 11.3 percent reported that they were not satisfied. In comparing these data, note that while one-half of the female directors reported these conditions "very satisfactory," only 35.5 percent of the men directors agreed with them.

Part F shows that 94.5 percent of all the directors were satisfied or very satisfied with their working relations with college supervisors. Only 1.3 percent reported that the working relationships were unsatisfactory or very unsatisfactory. Directors in private institutions and female directors reported no unsatisfactory working relations with college supervisors. A high percentage of the directors (71.6 percent) responded in the "very satisfactory" column.

The directors' working relations with college of education personnel are most important to the growth of the program. Part G reveals positive working relations. Of all directors, 96.1 percent reported satisfactory or very satisfactory relations. Only four directors indicated unsatisfactory working relationships.

Part H deals with the working relations that directors of student teaching have with other colleges or divisions. In all, 443 directors (94.7 percent) were very satisfied or satisfied with the cooperation offered by other colleges or divisions within their institutions. Only 10 directors were not satisfied with their working relationships.

The fairness with which duties were distributed to directors of student teaching is reported in Part I. Approximately nine out of ten directors were satisfied (42.4 percent) or very satisfied (43.8 percent) with their assigned duties. Only 53 directors (11.3 percent) were not satisfied or very dissatisfied with the fairness of assigned duties.

How satisfied the directors were with their total teaching and administrative loads is reported in Part J. One out of four directors was not satisfied with these loads. Part J shows that 101 directors (21.6 percent) were not satisfied and 16 directors (3.4 percent) were very dissatisfied.

Part K shows how satisfied the directors were regarding the number of student teachers they must supervise. Approximately seven out of ten felt content with the number of student teachers assigned. Of the directors reporting an unsatisfactory policy, 54 (11.5 percent) were dissatisfied, 15 (3.2 percent) were very dissatisfied. Approximately one-third of the directors were very

satisfied with the arrangements concerning the number of students they had to supervise.

Part L shows that 86.7 percent of the directors were satisfied (40.8 percent) or very satisfied (45.9 percent) with the transportation policy in their institutions. Only 47 directors were dissatisfied with the present arrangement.

Directors of student teaching replied "very content" when asked to consider their positions as a whole. Of all the directors, 448 (95.9 percent) were very satisfied (45.9 percent) or satisfied (50 percent). Part M reveals that only 13 directors were not satisfied; no director was very dissatisfied.

In Table 47 job satisfaction responses, "very satisfactory" and "satisfactory," are combined and placed in a single column. "Unsatisfactory" and "very unsatisfactory" responses are also combined and considered together. This table shows that the directors of student teaching were quite satisfied with their positions.

In four categories the directors reported over 70 percent satisfaction; in five categories they reported greater than 80 percent satisfaction. In the remaining categories the directors reported over 90 percent satisfaction. The only category that points out some dissatisfaction deals with the directors' views of the total teaching and administrative loads. One out of four directors was not satisfied.

TABLE 47 JOB SATISFACTION—BY DEGREE

Job description	Very satisfactory *or* satisfactory		Unsatisfactory *or* very unsatisfactory		No response	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Rank policy for directors of student teaching	416	88.9	30	6.4	22	4.7
Rank policy for college supervisors	400	85.5	35	7.5	33	7.0
Salary policy for the director of student teaching	370	79.1	72	15.4	26	5.5
Salary policy for college supervisors	373	79.7	58	12.4	37	7.9
Willingness of institution to support a quality student teaching program	403	86.1	53	11.3	12	2.6
Director's relations with college supervisors	442	94.5	6	1.3	20	4.2
Director's relations with college division of education personnel	450	96.1	4	0.9	14	3.0
Director's relations with personnel from other colleges or divisions	443	94.7	10	2.1	15	3.2
Fairness of distribution of duties to director	408	86.2	53	11.3	7	1.5
Director's teaching and administrative load	343	73.3	117	25.0	8	1.7
Number of student teachers assigned to director	342	73.1	69	14.7	57	12.2
Transportation policy for director	406	86.7	47	10.1	15	3.2
Director's position as a whole	448	95.9	13	2.8	6	1.3

CHAPTER VI

RESPONSIBILITIES

THIS CHAPTER DRAWS ATTENTION to the key responsibilities of the directors of student teaching in the AACTE institutions. Table 48 gives primary consideration to the directors' responsibilities in guiding the student teaching program.

Part A of Table 48 is concerned with the directors' responsibilities to student teachers. The placement of student teachers was checked as a responsibility by 94.2 percent of the directors, while 73.7 percent were responsible for supervising student teachers. Part A reveals that with the exception of conducting seminars for students before student teaching, the directors were most often involved in tasks related to the operation of the student teaching program.

Preparation of a student teaching program budget was a responsibility of 56.2 percent of the directors. Part B reveals that 94 percent of the directors were responsible for developing handbooks and forms used in the student teaching program.

Part C shows that the selection of college supervisors was a responsibility of 63 percent of the directors; 112 directors (23.9 percent) were responsible for selecting coordinators of resident centers; and 78.4 percent were responsible for orienting new college supervisors.

Part D shows that approximately six out of ten (58.3 percent) directors provided in-service programs for supervising teachers in fulfilling their responsibilities. This total is close to the 64.1 percent of the directors who screened supervising teachers before student teachers were assigned to them.

Less than one-half of the directors had initiated or were carrying on research programs. Part E shows that 48.9 percent of the directors were involved in initiating and carrying on experimental programs.

Part F reveals that only 3.2 percent were also directors of the laboratory school; but 19.9 percent reported having control over the student teaching program in the laboratory school.

TABLE 48 RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIRECTORS

Responsibility	A responsibility		Not A responsibility	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Part A: Student teacher				
Placing student teachers	441	94.2	27	5.8
Conferring with student teacher applicants	425	90.8	43	9.2
Reporting final grade in student teaching	375	80.1	93	19.9
Supervising student teachers	345	73.7	123	26.3
Final decisions on problems involving student teacher	443	94.7	25	5.3
Maintaining permanent record on student teaching	395	84.4	73	15.6
Determining eligibility for student teaching applicants	388	82.9	80	17.1
Conducting seminars for student teachers	329	70.3	139	29.7
Conducting seminars before student teaching	194	41.5	274	58.5
Removal of student teacher from assignment	440	94.0	28	6.0
Part B: Materials for program				
Developing handbook and forms used in program	440	94.0	28	6.0
Preparing reports on program	421	90.0	47	10.0
Preparing student teaching budget	263	56.2	205	43.8
Part C: College Supervisor				
Selecting college supervisor	295	63.0	173	37.0
Selecting coordinators of resident centers	112	23.9	356	76.1
Orienting new college supervisors	367	78.4	101	21.6
Part D: Cooperating school personnel				
Providing in-service programs for supervising teachers	273	58.3	195	41.7
Payment to cooperating school personnel	308	65.8	160	34.2
Screening supervising teachers	300	64.1	168	35.9
Establishing relations with cooperating school personne	438	93.6	30	6.4
Part E: Research and experimental programs				
Initiating and carrying out research	226	48.3	242	51.7
Initiating and carrying out experimentation	229	48.9	239	51.1
Part F: Laboratory schools				
Director of laboratory school	15	3.2	453	96.8
Control of student teacher in laboratory school	93	19.9	375	81.1

CHAPTER VII

MAJOR PROBLEMS

THE DIRECTORS OF STUDENT TEACHING were asked to list three major problems facing them in directing their programs. Of the 456 directors who responded, 268 listed three problems, 115 listed two problems, and 73 listed only one problem. Data pertaining to the directors' major problems in student teaching are included in Table 49. This table reveals that the most pressing problem confronting directors was the lack of qualified supervising teachers in the cooperating schools. Of the 456 directors listing problems, 170 (37.3 percent) state the need for qualified supervising teachers.

The employment of qualified college supervisors was listed as a major problem by 132 (28.9 percent) of the directors. Related to this were other problems dealing with college supervisors, such as their transportation to and from cooperating schools, in-service education programs for them, the reduction of their work loads, and evaluating them and upgrading them in rank.

The development of a high-quality student teaching program was listed by 118 directors (25.9 percent) as a major problem. Related to this was institutional support of the student teaching program, listed as a problem by 16.2 percent of the directors.

Approximately one-fourth of the directors said the placement of student teachers was a problem. Three directors reported that getting student teachers to go off-campus to do their directed teaching was a problem.

About one-tenth of the directors felt that providing in-service programs for supervising teachers was a problem. Another one-tenth felt that it was difficult to develop closer working relations between the college and the schools.

The fair distribution of duties for the director of student teaching was considered a major problem by 10.1 percent of the directors; the screening of student teachers for entrance into the student teaching program, by 8.1 percent; payment of supervising teachers, by 6.8 percent.

TABLE 49 MAJOR PROBLEMS OF DIRECTORS

Major problem	Number of directors reporting	Percent
Lack of qualified supervising teachers	170	37.3
Employment of qualified college supervisors	132	28.9
Development of high-quality student teaching programs	118	25.9
Placement of student teachers	115	25.2
Institutional support of the student teaching program	74	16.2
Providing in-service programs for supervising teachers	52	11.4
Developing closer relations between college and cooperating schools	52	11.4
Fair distribution of duties of director of student teaching	46	10.1
Screening of student teachers	37	8.1
Payment of supervising teachers	31	6.8
Providing adequate professional laboratory experiences	24	5.3
Establishment of additional centers	24	5.3
Securing collegewide appreciation for value of student teaching program	18	3.9
Clerical help	16	3.5
Transportation of student teachers	14	3.1
Closer working relations between elementary and secondary professional education programs	12	2.6
Evaluating student teaching program	11	2.4
Developing research programs	10	2.2
Transportation for college supervisor	10	2.2
In-service programs for college supervisors	9	1.9
Evaluating experimental programs	9	1.9
Reducing load of college supervisor	8	1.7
Revising student teaching program to meet state law	8	1.7
Reorganization of education department	7	1.5
Transition from student teaching to internship	7	1.5
Arranging block program	5	1.1
Evaluating role of college supervisor	4	0.9
NCATE approval	3	0.8
Upgrading rank of college supervisor	3	0.7
Legal status of student teachers	2	0.4
Certification standards for All states	1	0.2

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY

IN THE FOREGOING CHAPTERS a number of personal and professional characteristics of directors of student teaching are reported. This chapter includes a brief summary of the most important characteristics.

The majority of the 468 responding directors worked at institutions that had combined graduate and undergraduate enrollments of fewer than 4,000 students. Approximately four-fifths of the directors were in institutions that had fewer than 3,000 students enrolled in teacher education programs.

Slightly more than one-half of the directors were employed in colleges and universities financed at public expense. Factors such as these can influence a number of the directors' characteristics and responsibilities.

Fewer than 15 percent of the directors were women; of these, almost 75 percent were employed in private institutions, especially parochial colleges and universities. A slightly greater percentage of the men were employed in public institutions.

The male directors were, on the average, about four years younger than their female counterparts. They were also younger when they first became directors of student teaching.

Better than nine of ten male directors were married and almost three-fourths had children, while the greatest percentage of the women directors were not married and had no children.

The majority of the directors were well-educated. Only two of the 468 respondents had less than a master's degree, and almost 80 percent had either a doctorate in education or the doctor of philosophy degree. About 10 percent of the respondents did not have the doctorate when they first became a director of student teaching but completed the degree while in that position.

At the bachelor's degree level most of the directors had majored in a subject matter field commonly taught in schools, such as English and mathematics. At the master's and doctor's

degree levels the directors had usually majored in subject matter fields closely allied to teacher education, such as secondary, elementary, and counseling education. Many directors from both private and public institutions majored in secondary education and administration.

On the average, the directors had about 11 years of college teaching experience. Almost seven of ten had had at least ten years of precollege and college teaching experience before becoming directors of student teaching. However, over 50 percent had not served as supervising teachers and one-third had not been college supervisors before becoming directors of student teaching. Once assigned as a director, the directors seemed to be satisfied with their positions. Only two out of ten had held more than one different directorship.

The median gross annual salary of the directors was $11,900. On the average, directors from public institutions, both men and women, received larger salaries than did directors from private colleges and universities. The male directors from each type of institution averaged a larger salary than did their female counterparts.

Almost all directors were members of a state or school retirement plan. Other supplementary benefit plans, however, were often lacking. Directors from private colleges were more often provided paid life and medical insurance plans.

The average weekly work load of the directors from both private and public institutions was 16.9 hours directing student teaching, 8.6 hours in other administrative activities, and varying amounts of time in other noninstructional activities, such as student advisement, public service, and research. In their student teaching activities, directors from public colleges, on the average, devoted more of their time to these duties. Directors from public institutions also devoted more time to research activities, although only a few were actively involved in research.

Almost two-thirds of the directors were involved in on-campus teaching. As might be expected from the fact that directors from public colleges devoted more of their time to student teaching responsibilities, directors from private institutions, on the average, spent more of their time in on-campus teaching.

Only a few directors from both public and private institutions taught extension classes. However, 70 percent of the directors

from private colleges and 53.8 percent of those from publicly supported institutions were supervising student teachers.

To assist them in fulfilling their responsibilities, about one-fifth of the respondents had full-time secretarial help, while another one-fifth reported having both full-time secretarial assistants and part-time student help. Approximately 45 percent of the directors did not have full-time secretarial assistance and had to rely on part-time secretarial or student help.

In addition to secretarial help, about 18 percent of the directors were aided by assistant directors, and 7 percent relied on area coordinators for assistance. Four-fifths of the directors also were assisted by college supervisors.

As a part of their professional work load, more than half of the directors had published at least one journal article, and almost one-fifth had authored published books. Almost all of the directors (98.1 percent) were also members of at least one professional group. In addition, 93.2 percent were members of at least one committee.

The directors from both private and public institutions were satisfied with their positions as a group; 95.9 percent were "very satisfied" or "satisfied." No director was "very dissatisfied" with his position. This positive outlook was evident in the directors' responses to such other job satisfaction items as the policy of ranking for directors and college supervisors, salary policy for directors and college supervisors, directors' relations with various college personnel, transportation policy, willingness of institutions to support student teaching programs, and certain teaching load factors. In only one area—total teaching and administrative load—was some dissatisfaction expressed.

The directors were also responsible for a number of key activities. Over 90 percent were responsible for placing student teachers; conferring with student teaching applicants; removing student teachers from assignments; developing student teaching handbooks, forms, and reports; and establishing relations with cooperating school personnel. In addition, over 80 percent reported final student teaching marks, maintained permanent records, and determined eligibility of student teaching applicants. Over 70 percent of the respondents were also supervising and conducting seminars for student teachers and orienting new college supervisors.

Directors usually were not responsible for directing laboratory schools, controlling student teaching in laboratory schools, conducting seminars before the beginning of student teaching, and selecting resident center coordinators.

The problems that faced most of the directors were the lack of qualified supervising teachers and college supervisors, the development of high-quality student teaching programs, the placement of student teachers, and obtaining adequate institutional support.

APPENDIX
(Questionnaire)

THE ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
State College of Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

October 9, 1965

Dear Colleague:

Recently, the Chairman of the Research Committee of the Association for Student Teaching was contacted by a director of student teaching as to the feasibility of conducting a survey-type study of the Status and Duties of the Director of Student Teaching in the United States—a study which, in his words, "was needed." The questionnaire enclosed with this letter is an outgrowth of this query.

Would you please complete the questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed envelope by November 1, 1965. While it will undoubtedly take some of your valuable time to complete, the study should provide enough data on the director of student teaching to compensate you for the time invested.

The data obtained from the questionnaire will be included in an Association for Student Teaching publication soon after the results have been analyzed. No information identifying a separate individual will be published.

Thank you, in advance, for your cooperation in making this study a success.

Sincerely,

Le Roy Griffith, Arizona State University
Ray Martin, Boston College

68/69

The Research Committee
Leon Miller, NW Missouri State, Chairman
Clyde Crum, San Diego State
Milan Dady, NW Missouri State
Adrian Dupuis, Marquette U.
*L.H. Griffith, Arizona State U.
*Ray Martin, Boston College
W.B. Runge, U. of New Mexico
Herbert Smith, S. Illinois U.
William Walsh, Michigan State U.
Jo Ann White, Wayne State U.

*Research Coordinators

THE ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
State College of Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Director of Student Teaching:

In order to more clearly determine the present status of the Director of Student Teaching, we are interested in obtaining certain data from you. Would you please complete the following questionnaire and return it at your earliest convenience. The need for a study of this nature was brought to the attention of the A.S.T. Research Committee by a Director of Student Teaching.

This information is being collected for statistical purposes only. Data obtained from the questionnaire will be grouped. No information identifying a separate individual will be published.

In completing the questionnaire, use checkmarks to show your answers where no writing is necessary. Check mark only one alternative unless directed to do otherwise. Estimate if necessary, but ANSWER EVERY QUESTION.

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

1. Official Name of the Institution: _____

2. Location of Institution: _____
   Address City State

3. Person completing form: _____
   Name Title

PLEASE CHECK THE FOLLOWING:

4. FINANCING: Please indicate the source of financial support for your institution.
   ____Public
   ____Private
   ____Parochial

5. COMMUNITY: Please indicate the size of the community where the institution is located.

____0-2,499
____2,500-4,999
____5,000-9,999
____10,000-29,999

____30,000-99,999
____100,000-499,999
____500,000-1,000,000
____Over 1 Million

6. ENROLLMENT: Please indicate the number of graduate and undergraduate students who are enrolled this semester.

____0-499
____500-1,499
____1,500-3,499
____4,000-7,999

____8,000-14,999
____15,000-24,999
____Over 24,999

7. ENROLLMENT: Please indicate the number of graduate and undergraduate students who are currently enrolled in the college (school) of education for this semester.

____0-149
____150-499
____500-999
____1,000-2,999

____3,000-4,999
____5,000-9,999
____Over 9,999

INFORMATION ON DIRECTOR OF STUDENT TEACHING

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

8. DEGREE: Please indicate in the space provided the highest degree you hold from a college or university.

9. DEGREE WHEN BECAME DIRECTOR: Please indicate in the space provided the highest college degree you held when you first became director of student teaching.

10. TEACHING IN COLLEGE: Please indicate in the space provided the number of years you have been employed in a college or university. (Include this year in your total.)

11. YEARS AS DIRECTOR: Please indicate in the space provided the number of years you have served as director of student teaching at the college or university level. (Include this year in your total.)

12. TEACHING AT PRE-COLLEGE LEVEL: Please indicate in the space provided the number of years you have taught at the elementary or high school level. (Include your experience as a school administrator in this total.)

13. SUPERVISING TEACHER: If you served as a supervising teacher while you taught in elementary or high school, please indicate the number of years you served as supervising teacher.

14. COLLEGE SUPERVISOR: Please indicate in the space provided the number of years you served as a college supervisor of student teachers prior to becoming director of student teaching.

15. TEACHING PRIOR TO DIRECTORSHIP: Please indicate in the space provided the total number of years of teaching at both pre-college and college levels you had prior to being employed as director of student teaching.

16. AGE AS DIRECTOR: Please indicate in the space provided your age when you first became director of student teaching.

17. DIFFERENT POSITIONS: Please indicate in the space provided the number of different directorships you have held.

18. SEX: Please indicate your sex.

19, 20, 21: MAJORS: Please indicate with checks your majors in undergraduate and graduate school. If you hold a doctorate, please check your majors for the doctors, masters and bachelors degrees. Directors with master degrees should place checks in both the masters and bachelors degree columns. Directors who hold only the bachelors degree should place a check in just the bachelors degree column. (If your major for any degree is not listed, use the spaces provided and record your major in the appropriate column.)

Major	Bachelors Degree	Masters Degree	Doctors Degree
Agriculture			
Art			
Education:			
Elementary (no subject matter major)			
Secondary (not listed elsewhere as a major) Educational Administration			
English			
Home Economics			
Industrial Arts			
Journalism			
Language: French			
German			
Latin			
Russian			
Spanish			
Mathematics			
Music			
Physical Education			
Psychology			
Science: Biology			
Chemistry			
General Science			
Physics			
Social Science: Economics			
Geography			
History			
Political Science			
Sociology			
Social Studies			
Speech			
Special Education (please specify)			
Other Majors (please specify)			

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

22. AGE: Please indicate in the space provided your age to the last birthday.

23. MARITAL STATUS: Please indicate in the space provided your present marital status.

24. CHILDREN: Please indicate in the space provided the number of children you are presently supporting.

25. SALARY: Please record in the space provided your average yearly increase (in percent figures) in salary since obtaining your present directorship.

    _____%

26. SALARY: Please record in the space provided the gross annual salary you expect to receive for your teaching this year. Please include salary you expect to receive from teaching in summer school and extension classes, but do not include money you will receive from such sources as consulting and stocks and bonds.

    _____Gross Salary

27. SALARY: Using your gross salary from Item 26, please indicate the amount you expect to receive for each of the following terms of employment:

    _____Academic Year (Sept. to June)
    _____Fiscal Year (July 1 to June 30)
    _____First Summer
    _____Second Summer
    _____Extension
    _____Other (please denote)

28. SALARY: Using the percentage increase indicated in Item 25 for comparative purposes, how does your average salary increase compare with the average increases of the other college personnel with whom you work who have the same college degree and length of experience?

    USE THE FOLLOWING CODE:
    H = Higher Than
    S = Same As
    L = Lower Than
    NC = Not Certain

    _____Administrative Staff
    _____Division Chairmen
    _____Department Chairmen
    _____Distinguished Professors
    _____Professors
    _____Associate Professors
    _____Assistant Professors
    _____Instructors

29. SALARY: Using only that part of your salary that you receive for the academic year as a base (September to June), how does your salary compare with that of other college personnel with whom you work who have the same college degree and length of experience?

USE THE FOLLOWING CODE:

H = Higher Than L = Lower Than
S = Same As NC = Not Certain

_____Administrative Staff _____Professors
_____Division Chairmen _____Associate Professors
_____Department Chairmen _____Assistant Professors
_____Distinguished Professors _____Instructors

PLEASE CHECK THE FOLLOWING:

30. SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFITS: For each of the fringe benefits provided you at your institution, check the appropriate space.

____State Retirement Plan
____Social Security
____School Retirement Plan
____Sabbatical Leave
____Paid Life Insurance Plan
____Paid Medical Insurance Plan
____Reduced College Fees For Family
Other:

31. RANK: As director of student teaching, do you also have professional rank?

____Yes ____No

If yes, please indicate the highest rank you now hold.

____Instructor
____Assistant Professor
____Associate Professor
____Professor

32. RANK: When you became director of student teaching at the institution where you are now employed, did you have professional rank?

____Yes ____No

If yes, what rank did you hold?

____Instructor
____Assistant Professor
____Associate Professor
____Professor

33. PROMOTION: As director of student teaching, have you been promoted (or do you anticipate being promoted) as you have met (meet) the criteria for advancement in your institution?

____Yes ____No

If your answer is *no*, has your position (will your position) as director of student teaching caused (cause) a delay in advancement?

____Yes ____No ____Not Certain

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

34. ASSISTANTS: Please indicate the number of non-professional secretarial assistants who are assigned to you, the average number of hours they work each week, and their term of employment.

	Number	Average no. of hours worked per week	Academic Year	Fiscal Year
Full-time Secretaries	____	____	____	____
	____	____	____	____
Part-time Secretaries	____	____	____	____
	____	____	____	____
Student Help	____	____	____	____
	____	____	____	____

35. ASSISTANTS: Please indicate the number of professionals assigned to work with you and the percentage of time they devote to student teaching activities.

	Number	Average % of Time Devoted to Student Teaching
Assistant Directors	____	____
	____	____
Area Coordinators	____	____
	____	____
College Supervisors	____	____
	____	____

36. LOAD: Please record in the spaces provided in the right hand column the number of hours per week you spend in the following instructional and non-instructional activities WHETHER YOU DO THE WORK AT SCHOOL, AT HOME OR ELSEWHERE. The total number of hours reported should equal the average number of hours you devote to your college position each week. For convenience in handling your responses, please follow the specific directions which are included in each section.

A. *NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES:* Please indicate the number of hours per week you devote to such activities as directing student teaching, administration, research, committee work, and public service. If you have advisement, committee work and administrative responsibilities in addition to your responsibilities as Director of Student Teaching, please record the hours you spend on these activities.

Hours Per Week

Director of Student Teaching ..... ___
Other Administrative Duties ..... ___
Other Advisement Duties ..... ___
Public Service (Speeches, Consultancies, etc.) ..... ___
Sponsored Research ..... ___
Individual Research ..... ___
Other ..... ___

B. *INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES:* Please indicate the number of hours per week you devote to such teaching activities as lecturing, supervising student teachers, teaching independent study or reading and conference courses, and serving on theses and dissertation committees.

Hours Per Week

Teaching lecture and discussion courses ..... ___
Extension Teaching ..... ___
Supervising Student Teachers ..... ___
Other (Handling theses, reading and conference courses, etc.) ..... ___

37. ENROLLMENT: Please record the yearly enrollment in student teaching for the 1964-65 school year.

_____Academic Year _____Summer School

38. SUPERVISING LOAD: Please record the number of student teachers you are personally supervising this semester.

_____

For this school, this total is:
____Above Average
____About Average
____Below Average

39. PUBLICATIONS: In the spaces provided, please record the number of journal articles and books you have had published.
____Articles
____Books

40. PROMOTION: Are publications and research the primary measuring devices for your promotion at your institution?
____Yes ____No ____Not Certain

41. PROFESSIONAL GROUPS: Please indicate with a check the number of professional groups to which you belong.

____None	____3	____6
____1	____4	____7
____2	____5	____Other

42. COOPERATING SYSTEMS: In the space provided, please record the number of off-campus school systems with which you are cooperating this year in placing student teachers and also the number of different school plants and cooperating teachers used.

____School Systems
____Different School Plants
____Cooperating Teachers

43. COMMITTEES: Please indicate with a check the number of institutional committees to which you have been assigned or elected.

____None	____3	____6
____1	____4	____7
____2	____5	____Other

44. TEACHING: Do you teach a course in supervising the student teacher?

____Yes ____No
If yes, please indicate the hours of credit given for the course and where it is taught.

Hours of credit____
On Campus____
Extension____

45. TRANSPORTATION: Please indicate with a check the provisions made by your college for transporting you as you fulfill your responsibilities as Director of Student Teaching.

____College provides transportation
____Provide own transportation, College reimburses expenses
____Provide own transportation and expenses
____Other

46. JOB SATISFACTION: Please write the code number which best expresses your satisfaction in your present position with respect to each of the following categories.

USE THE FOLLOWING CODE: 4 Very Satisfactory
3 Satisfactory
2 Unsatisfactory
1 Very Unsatisfactory

____The rank policy for the Director of Student Teaching
____The rank policy for college supervisors
____The salary policy for the Director of Student Teaching
____The salary policy for college supervisors
____The willingness of the institution to support a quality student teaching program
____Your relations with your college supervisors
____Your relations with college (division) of education personnel
____Your relations with personnel from other colleges or divisions
____Fairness with which duties are distributed to you
____Your total teaching and administrative load
____The number of student teachers you must supervise
____The transportation policy for the Director of Student Teaching
____Your position as a whole

47. RESPONSIBILITIES: Please check those items normally part of the director of student teaching's responsibilities at your institution. Do not include other college responsibilities.

____Preparing financial budget for student teaching
____Selecting college supervisors
____Selecting coordinators of residence centers
____Placing student teachers
____Conferring with student teacher applicants
____Reporting final grades in student teaching
____Providing in-service programs for cooperating teachers
____Developing handbooks and other forms used in student teaching
____Supervising student teachers
____Preparing honorarium payments for off-campus cooperating teachers
____Arriving at final decisions on problems involving student teachers
____Maintaining permanent records of student and cooperating teachers
____Determining eligibility of students who apply for student teaching
____Screening off-campus teachers for assignments as cooperating teachers
____Conducting seminars for student teachers
____Conducting seminars for students preparing for student teaching
____Orienting new college supervisors
____Initiating and carrying out research
____Preparing reports on the student teaching program
____Initiating and carrying out experimental programs
____Establishing good public relations with off-campus school personnel
____Power to remove a student teacher from his assignment
____Directing laboratory school
____If not director of the laboratory school, has authority over student teaching program in the laboratory school

OTHERS:

_____

_____

_____

48. PROBLEMS: Please list the three major problems that you see facing you as director of student teaching the next few years: (Use insert if you need to)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return in the envelope which accompanies this form.
Thank you

The Research Committee

Leon Miller, NW Missouri State, Chmn.
Clyde Crum, San Diego State
Milan Dady, NW Missouri State
Adrian Dupuis, Marquette U.
°L. H. Griffith, Arizona State U.
°Ray Martin, Boston College
W. B. Runge, U. of New Mexico
Herbert Smith, S. Illinois U.
William Walsh, Michigan State U.
Jo Ann White, Wayne State U.

°Research Coordinators

PUBLICATION LIST AND ORDER BLANK

Quantity	Title
	YEARBOOKS
_____	1967 Mental Health and Teacher Education $4.75 (860-24420)
_____	1966 Professional Growth Inservice of the Supervising Teacher $4.75 (860-24418
_____	1965 Theoretical Bases for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education $3.50 (860-24416)
_____	1964 The College Supervisor: Conflict and Challenge $3.50 (860-24414)
_____	1963 Concern for the Individual in Student Teaching $3.00 (860-24412)
_____	1962 Outlook in Student Teaching $3.00 (860-24410)
_____	1960 Evaluating Student Teaching $3.00 (860-24408)
_____	1958 Improving Instruction in Professional Education $2.50 (860-24418)
_____	1957 Guidance in Teacher Education $2.50 (860-24404)
_____	1956 Four Went to Teach $2.00 (860-24402)
_____	1951 Off-Campus Student Teaching $2.00 (860-24400)
	COMMISSION PUBLICATIONS
_____	Position Paper 1 The Supervising Teacher: Standards for Selection and Function (1966) $1.00 (861-24456)
_____	The Study of Teaching, Edited by Corrigan (1967) $1.50 (861-24458)
	RESEARCH BULLETINS
_____	5 Research on Student Teaching, '50-'65, Edited by Miller, Fullerton, Smith (1965) $1.00 (868-24452)
_____	6 Studying Role Relationships, Corrigan & Garland (1966) $1.00 (868-24454)
_____	7 The Director of Student Teaching: Characteristics and Responsibilities, Griffith & Martin (1968) $1.50 (868-24460)
	BULLETINS
_____	7 Prospective Teachers Learn from Experience with Children and Youth - McCuskey, Rabin, Conaway (1957) $.50 (867-24422)
_____	12 Preparation for Cooperative Decision Making - Caesar, Moody (1960) $.50 (867-24428)
_____	15 The Value Approach to Student Teaching - Lowe (1961) $.50 (867-24430)
_____	16 Building Good Relationships: A Major Role of the College Supervisor - Edwards (1961) $.50 (867-24432)
_____	17 The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education - Dewey (1962) $1.00 (867-24434)
_____	19 The Student Teacher Evaluates Pupil Progress - Burns & Brown (1962) $.75 (867-24436)
_____	20 Research and Professional Experiences in Teacher Education - Edited by Smith and Haines (1963) $1.25 (867-24438)

_____ 21 **The Student Teacher's Experience in the Community - Blair and Erickson (1964) $1.00 (867-24440)**

_____ 22 New Developments, Research, and Experimentation in Professional Laboratory Experiences - Edited by Nash-Lofthouse (1964) $2.00 (867-24442)

_____ 23 **The Student Teacher: Managing an Elementary Classroom - Jensen & Jensen (1964) $1.00 (867-24444)**

_____ 25 **The Student Teacher and Team Teaching - Fullerton, Griffith (1966) $1.25 (867-24446)**

_____ 26 **The Student Teacher and Human Relations - Ramsey (1966) $1.00 (867-24448)**

_____ 27 **The Student Teacher and Professional Activities - Loftis (1966) $1.00 (867-24450)**

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES

_____ An Annotated Bibliography on the Professional Education of Teachers. Bibliography for the Forty-Seventh Yearbook, Internships in Teacher Education (1968) $1.00 (861-24462)

HOW TO ORDER AST PUBLICATIONS

DISCOUNTS: Single copy of each title, full price; 2-9 copies of a title, 10 percent; 10 or more copies of a title, 20 percent; to bookstores and other agencies for resale purposes, 20 percent on shipments to one address.

SHIPPING CHARGES: Orders amounting to $2.00 or less must be accompanied by payment. The National Education Association will pay shipping and handling charges on all orders accompanied by payment. Any orders not accompanied by payment will be billed with shipping and handling charges. Make all checks or money orders payable to the NEA.

_____ Payment enclosed (Required on orders of $2.00 or less)
_____ Bill me (Mailing costs added)

Name _____

Street _____

City & State _____

Please return this order form to:

Publications - Sales Section
National Education Association
1201 16th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036